BX
8
B85

Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME
FROM THE
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF
Henry W. Sage
1891

A 238324 28/10/09

3513-1

The date shows when this volume was taken.
To renew this book copy the call No. and give to the librarian.

NOV 15 1909

JAN 15 1910

HOME USE RULES.

All Books subject to Recall.

Books not used for instruction or research are returnable within 4 weeks.

Volumes of periodicals and of pamphlets are held in the library as much as possible. For special purposes they are given out for a limited time.

Borrowers should not use their library privileges for the benefit of other persons.

Books not needed during recess periods should be returned to the library, or arrangements made for their return during borrower's absence, if wanted.

Books needed by more than one person are held on the reserve list.

Books of special value and gift books, when the giver wishes it, are not allowed to circulate.

Readers are asked to report all cases of books marked or mutilated.

Do not deface books by marks and writing.

Cornell University Library
BX8 .B85
Church unity; studies of its most import
3 1924 029 357 443
olin

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://archive.org/details/cu31924029357443

BOOKS BY CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

PUBLISHED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Church Unity. 8vo, *net*	$2.50
The Book of Psalms. (*International Critical Commentary.*) 2 vols. Cr. 8vo, *net*	6.00
The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. 12mo, *net*	1.50
New Light on the Life of Jesus. 12mo, *net*	1.20
The Incarnation of the Lord. 8vo, *net* .	1.50
General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture. 8vo, *net*	3.00
The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. Cr. 8vo	2.50
The Messiah of the Apostles. Cr. 8vo .	3.00
The Messiah of the Gospels. Cr. 8vo .	2.00
The Bible, the Church and the Reason. Cr. 8vo	1.75
American Presbyterianism. Cr. 8vo .	3.00

CHURCH UNITY

CHURCH UNITY

STUDIES OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

BY

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt.

GRADUATE PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND SYMBOLICS IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1909

T

29/X/09

7511
D/26

A 238324

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published September, 1909

To

WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON, D.D., LL.D.

THE CHIEF EXPONENT OF CHURCH UNITY IN AMERICA

THIS BOOK

IS DEDICATED IN GRATITUDE AND LOVE

PREFACE

For twenty-five years and more the author has laboured in behalf of Church Unity, and has made numerous addresses on the subject, before Roman Catholics in America, France and in Rome; before Protestant bodies of many different denominations in different countries; and everywhere he has been welcomed with sympathetic attention. He has also written a large number of articles on the subject in reviews, magazines, and journals of various kinds, both at home and abroad. He has conversed on the subject with many of the ablest theologians and chief dignitaries of the several Christian Churches. For four years he has been lecturing in the Union Theological Seminary upon the new discipline of *Christian Irenics*.

Many have urged him, from time to time, to gather his papers together in a volume for their wider and more lasting influence; but he has refrained because he wished to make a thorough investigation of three most difficult questions: Infallibility, the Sacramental System, and the Validity of Orders. After many years of study this has been accomplished; and there is no further reason for delaying the publication of the book.

A number of articles, published in various periodicals during the past twenty-five years, have been used. But these have all been carefully revised, and put in their proper order in the volume. At least one-half of the material of this book has not been previously published. The plan of

the volume is to give a series of studies of the chief problems of Church Unity. This plan involves a certain amount of repetition here and there of minor questions. But such repetition is more formal than real; for these questions are considered from different points of view, which in fact puts them in different lights and relations.

The volume is an earnest effort to solve the hard problems of Church Unity, and to reconcile the various parties to the controversies which distract Christendom. There is an ever increasing number, who are weary of these fruitless controversies and are eager to see their way to a better understanding of the real issues. It is the hope of the author to encourage such, and above all to stimulate young men of courage and goodwill, to undertake this work of Christian Irenics, and to share in the study of its hard problems.

May this volume, with all its defects, do something to advance the reunion of Christendom, a cause dear to the heart of Jesus, and to men of goodwill in all ages and nations and denominations of Christians.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. CHRISTIAN IRENICS 1
- Its Tasks 4
- Its Spirit 11

II. BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH . . . 23
- The Term Church 24
- The Kingdom of God 33
- Other Biblical Terms for Church 37

III. CATHOLIC—THE NAME AND THE THING . . 46
- The Term Catholic 46
- Catholicity and Apostolicity 50
- Catholicity and Orthodoxy 55
- Catholic and Roman 57
- The Ethical Principle of Catholicity 61
- The Religious Principle of Catholicity . . . 64
- Geographical Unity and Catholicity 66
- The Catholic Reaction 69

IV. THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE 73
- Church and State 74
- The Historic Episcopate as a Term of Union . 79
- Grounds of Opposition to Episcopacy 82
- Advantages of the Historic Episcopate . . . 93

V. VALIDITY OF ORDERS 102
- The Apostolic Commission 102
- The Presbyter Bishops 105
- The Validity of Anglican Orders 110
- The Validity of Presbyterian Orders 127
- What Is Order? 145
- Order and Sacrament 148

PAGE

Function and Jurisdiction 152
Restoration of the Episcopate 159
Recognition of Orders 161

VI. ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION 169
Territorial Jurisdiction 176
Subject-Matter of Jurisdiction 181
Jurisdiction of Persons 193

VII. THE REAL AND THE IDEAL IN THE PAPACY . . 201
The Biblical Basis of the Papacy 202
The Historic Right of the Papacy 205
Primacy of the Pope and Its Limitations . . 207

VIII. INFALLIBILITY, TRUE AND FALSE 221
Infallibility of the Reason 223
Infallibility of the Church 226
Infallibility of the Bible 236
Apostolic Tradition 241
The Threefold Infallibility 243

IX. THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM 246
The Number of the Sacraments 246
The Five Minor Sacraments 250
The Relation of the Divine Grace in the Sacraments to the Persons of the Holy Trinity 258
Sacramental Grace 258
The Sacramental Work of the Holy Spirit . 261
The Sacramental Presence of Christ 263
The Relation of the Grace Conferred to the Elements Through Which It Is Conferred 266
The Conversion of the Elements 266
The Eucharistic Sacrifice 272
Dramatic Representation 278
The Body of Christ 280
Christophanic Presence 289
Effects of the Sacraments Upon Those Who Use Them 294

PAGE

The Ecstatic State 295
The Preservation of Body and Soul 297

X. CHURCH AND CREED 299
The Apostles' Creed 299
The Nicene Creed 301
Symbols of Faith 306
Revision of Symbols 308

XI. THE THEOLOGICAL CRISIS, ESPECIALLY IN AMERICA 315
The Advance of the Church 316
The Real Issues 319
The Seat of Authority in Religion 321
Holy Scripture 323
Inerrancy 328
The Bible as a Means of Grace 332
Last Things 334
The Middle State 335
Redemption After Death 341
Salvation of Infants and Heathen 345
Progressive Sanctification After Death . . . 350
The Lost 360
The Christ 363
The Gain 364

XII. THE INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 366
The Decision of the Archbishops as to the Three Ceremonies 366
The Anglo-Catholic and Puritan Parties . . 368
Reservation of the Sacrament 370
The Principle of Uniformity 374
Failure of the Acts of Uniformity 376
The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline 385
Regulated Liberty of Worship 388

PAGE

XIII. THE ENCYCLICAL AGAINST MODERNISM . . 393

The Syllabus 394
The Encyclical 395
The Modernists 397
Mediaevalism 402
The New Inquisition 405

XIV. THE GREAT OBSTACLE IN THE WAY OF A REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM 410

The Papal Dominion Not Absolute 410
The Threefold Cord of Unity 412
Unlimited Jurisdiction Condemned by History 413
The Right of Reformation and Revolution . . 416
A Constitutionalised Papacy 421

XV. THE PASSING AND THE COMING CHRISTIANITY 426

Passing Protestantism 428
The Mediating Modernism 435
The Coming Catholicism 442

INDEX 453

CHURCH UNITY

CHURCH UNITY

I

CHRISTIAN IRENICS

CHRISTIAN IRENICS is that theological discipline which aims to reconcile the discordant elements of Christianity, and to organize them in peace and concord, in the unity of Christ's Church. It is one of those new theological disciplines which have sprung up in recent times on the border-lines of the older theological disciplines, and which refuse to be classified under any of them, unless they are so enlarged as to involve a reconstruction of Theological Encyclopedia. Christian Irenics is indeed the culminating discipline to which all others contribute their noblest results, the apex of the pyramid of Christian theology, to which all the lines of Christian scholarship and Christian life tend, and in which ultimately they find their highest end and perfection.

Christian Irenics is usually classed with Symbolics—that theological discipline which studies the official expression of the faith of the Church as it is stereotyped in symbols—that is, Creeds, Confessions of Faith and Catechisms. From this point of view, Irenics takes the material given by Symbolics, holds forth the consensus of Christianity as the basis of peace and unity already attained, and then studies the dissensus in order to find even there the pathway to complete and perfect peace and unity. It is thus the antithesis to Polemics.

Polemics takes its stand upon one symbol or group of symbols, representing one particular denomination of Christians, or school of theology, and makes war upon everything

that differs from that. It aims to overcome and destroy all dissent from that one particular dissensus.

On the contrary, Irenics refuses to regard any one of the particular denominational or school statements as final; it rather seeks to discover the truth and right in all this dissensus, and to eliminate them from error and wrong; and then to detect the lines of development which lead on to more comprehensive statements in which dissensus may eventually be transformed into consensus. Accordingly, Irenics cannot be attached to Symbolics as a section of Symbolics or as a mode of using Symbolics. It is much more comprehensive. If it finds Symbolics a convenient base on which to begin its work, it soon outgrows Symbolics and expands on all sides. It is evident that the peace of the Church cannot be effected within the sphere of Christian symbols alone, since in some respects the severer problems are in the sphere of Church government and worship. Liturgies and ecclesiastical canons, therefore, demand historic and comparative study, and irenic use, as well as creeds, confessions and catechisms.

Polemics and Irenics thus far have the same reach. It is not sufficient that there should be peace here and war there. Polemics is war all along the line of institution, faith and morals. Irenics is peace-making over the whole field of theology.

But Polemics has its limitations. It battles for the denominational or sectarian institution and dogma as the indubitable and the final statement, and with a determination to destroy all that is discordant therewith. It has little, if any, interest in the historical origin of those institutions or dogmas. It is regarded as disloyal to subject them to any kind of criticism. It is counted as downright treason to propose new and better statements.

Irenics, on the contrary, searches all the statements thoroughly. It must know exactly how they came into historic being; for only so can it determine how much of them was the genuine and necessary product of Christianity, and how

much was due to human frailty and ignorance, or to unchristian motives and influences. It must study the history of the statements in their use in the Church; for only so can one go back of the traditional interpretation that usually drifts from the original sense through change in the meaning of the words, the unconscious adaptation of old terms to new situations, and the continuous reconstruction of dogma in the treatises of the theologian and the homilies of the pulpit. Irenics is not content with these discordant statements as they are. It cannot say: This one is altogether true; the others are altogether false. It must put them all alike into the fires of criticism, testing them in every way, to eliminate the dross of error from the golden truth, confident that truth is indestructible and imperishable. It tests them by Holy Scripture, by the Reason, by Christian experience, as well as by the decisions of the Church in their original sense.

Above all, Irenics looks to the future. Its right to live and work is the confidence that the present dissensus of Christendom will not endure, that those who disagree from us are not ordinarily dishonest or wicked, but rather that the statements which we cherish are not sufficiently clear, evident and convincing; do not adequately express the truth; do not yet fully contain it; but urge to reinvestigation, revision, new and better statements of the faith of the Church.

Thus Irenics uses all other theological disciplines. It grasps the past, the present and the future in its comprehensive vision. Its ideal is the loftiest and the noblest. It is sure that the discord and division of Christianity are temporary and transitional. It has unflinching confidence that in the "dispensation of the fulness of the times" God will "sum up all things in Christ"[1] and that Christ's prayer to the Father for his disciples will surely be realised, that "they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."[2]

[1] Eph. i. 10. [2] John xvii. 21.

I. ITS TASKS

(1) The first task of Irenics is to determine the *essentials* of Christianity; that which originally gave Christianity the right to exist as a new religion in the world; that which has remained permanent in all its evolutions; that which is to be found wherever and whenever and in whomsoever Christianity exists. This essence of Christianity is to be determined by the elimination of all that is local, temporal and formal from that which is universal. Here Irenics and the science of religion come into contact and healthful rivalry; for the science of religion seeks the essence of Christianity by the elimination from it of all that it has in common with other religions. Irenics seeks this same essence by the elimination of all that is special and peculiar to the several types of Christianity. This effort is fundamental to Irenics; for, unless we have correctly defined the essence of Christianity, we may mistake the limits of Christianity.

(2) The second task of Irenics is to determine what is *Catholic.* That is Catholic which is *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus;* it is more comprehensive than the essence of Christianity. The essence is not only original to Christianity; but it is that without which Christianity does not exist, and it distinguishes Christianity from other religions. The Catholic is that which Christianity stands for as an organised institution, as the Church of Christ in the midst of the world. Christianity may exist, and in fact did exist, with all that is essential, without Catholicity; but Catholicity is an inevitable development of Christianity. It is that which is common to Christianity when it has become mature, self-conscious, an organized institution, knowing what it stands for, and able to vindicate itself in institution and doctrine. This universality is not absolute: it is relative; for it excludes all those, whether as individuals or as organised communities, who cannot or will not know and

maintain the common heritage, the sacred deposit of the Christian Church. It is necessary to determine the range of Catholicity, or else we may include within the field of Irenics those who have no rights in the Catholic Church, or exclude others from their rightful heritage, and so mistake the scope of our work. On the one hand, there are those who so extend the area of Catholicity as to include what is distinctively Roman or Anglican, and then exclude all others from the Catholic Church. On the other hand, there are those who value so little the Catholic heritage of the Church that they resent the use of the term for institutions and doctrines of their own communion which are truly Catholic. A man or a communion may be Christian without being Catholic, and they may be Catholic and yet fall far short of the ideal of Christ and Christianity.

(3) The third task of Irenics is to determine *the consensus of Christianity*. This is much wider than Catholicity, and represents a subsequent stage of development. Consensus involves the organisation of different types and parties within the Catholic Church. The consensus is the concord which the several types of Christianity have attained at a particular stage in its development. The consensus is to be distinguished from *orthodoxy*. That is orthodox which has been finally defined as right doctrine by the supreme authority of the Church. If we could limit orthodoxy to those authoritative determinations to which all bow, consensus and orthodoxy would be co-extensive; but in fact orthodoxy as commonly used is particularistic, because all existing Church authorities, and all Church authorities that have been in the world for centuries, are particular and not universal jurisdictions.

The Greek Church, which prides itself on its orthodoxy, is more comprehensive than others in this respect; for it limits orthodoxy to the determinations of doctrine by the primitive Councils before the division between the Eastern and Western Churches. But even these exclude several Oriental Churches. The only orthodoxy which corresponds

with consensus is that of the Nicene Creed. Hence the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of unity declares it to be "the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith." The consensus is thus more limited than orthodoxy. Eventually they will correspond; but not until the Church has learned much more of the truth than it possesses at the present time.

The consensus becomes more comprehensive with the progress of the Church, and also more complex; so that we have to distinguish between the consensus of the whole Church at different periods of its history and the consensus of two or more particular Churches. Sometimes the consensus expands; then again contracts; but, on the whole, the consensus enlarges with the progress of Christianity. So we have to distinguish between temporary consensus and permanent consensus; between entire consensus and partial consensus. There is a special consensus of the Greek and Oriental Churches: there is another special consensus of the Roman Church with them. There is a consensus of Protestantism, and there is a consensus of the Reformed Churches. All this consensus, the consensus of the entire Church and the consensus of particular Churches, has to be determined; for it indicates the unity and concord thus far attained, the stepping-stones for our advance into the more difficult realm of discord. The consensus of Christianity is vastly more important than the dissensus. No one, who has not studied it, can estimate how vast and magnificent it is when compared with the dissensus. It is like a mighty river, flowing on in majestic silence, whilst its surface is disturbed by erratic currents and noisy wavelets, stirred by mischievous or angry winds. It is the murmur of the ever-flowing stream as compared with the occasional croaking of frogs upon its banks. Taking our stand upon the consensus of Christianity, we may thank God for the progress already made, and look forward with confidence toward a future of complete unity and perfect concord.

(4) The fourth task of Irenics is the study of the *dissensus*,

in order to find even there the truth which invokes concord and the error which promotes discord. In this field it is the exact and complete antithesis to Polemics. Polemics assumes that it has the truth already in possession, and that its duty is to defend that truth against all assaults, and attack all opposing statements. In the scholastic age of Protestantism, Polemic Theology was attached to Dogmatic Theology on the theory that the Confession of Faith gave the Christian Faith; and it was the duty of the dogmatic theologian so to state its doctrines as to make them impregnable in defence and invincible in attack. In theological schools which still adhere to the scholastic methods one may still find chairs of Polemic Theology.

It is not surprising that such schools should oppose revision of denominational standards and any kind of new dogmatic statement. It is their task to oppose new methods: new statements, new doctrines, everything that is new. They have already attained the final knowledge of the truth; they have nothing more to learn from Bible, Church or the progress of civilisation in the world.

But Truth cannot be boxed up and put away for safe keeping. It is too large for any enclosure. It is too strong for any chains. It is too expansive for any measures. Truth appears to men at first afar off with gracious invitation. Most men are content to gaze at her in the distance, conceive her in certain relations, and then go away with their photographic ideals and develop them in unchangeable abstractions. Not so can one know the truth. He who would truly know her, must go up to her with courage and courtesy, follow her about wherever she goes, do her bidding as her faithful knight, run after her, climb after her, pursue her in the heights above, in the depths beneath, and never lose sight of her, for she will lead him a long race, testing him in every way before she gives herself to him as the bride of his soul. Truth is a sacred deposit, a holy tradition in the Church; but it is not to be laid away in a napkin to be restored to the Lord exactly as it was received. If we are

faithful servants, we will use it, and it will increase in our hands, and we shall transmit to our successors manifold gains.

Truth is given to mankind only gradually. He has to learn it little by little in the progress of his education. So nations and races are educated step by step in the progress of the centuries. All institutions, all knowledge, all things living, all religions undergo this heavenly discipline; for the history of mankind is the divine education of our race. When Jesus promised his disciples that the Holy Spirit would lead them into all the truth, he did not mean that the Holy Spirit would lead the apostles into all the truth and leave that truth as an infallible deposit in the Church to which nothing could be added in knowledge and statement. The Holy Spirit did not guide the ante-Nicene Church until the Nicene Creed was given as the final statement of the Christian faith, and then leave the Church to itself to work out the hardest problems of Christianity. He did not cease his guidance at the Reformation. He did not give his last word at the Synod of Dort, or in the Formula of Concord, or to the Westminster Assembly, or through the Book of Common Prayer, or at the Council of the Vatican. He has not left the Christian world in a chaos of discordant theologies with the alternative of submission to an infallible pontiff. There never was a time when the Holy Spirit was more needed by Christians than in our age, and there never has been a time when the Divine Spirit was so operative as in this age of transition. All things are heaving and tossing in the throes that will surely give birth to a nobler, grander Christianity.

The Church of Rome recognised this when it stated the dogma of an infallible pontiff to guide the Church of the present and the future. However much formal error there may be in this dogma, it yet honours the divine Spirit as the present guide of the Church, speaking infallibly through its supreme head. It puts to shame that Protestant scholasticism which has, so far as it could, pushed the Holy Spirit

out of the Church by its insistence upon an irreformable system of dogma. An irreformable dogmatic statement in the present time, even if given by the Pope, is presumptively of more value than an irreformable dogmatic statement of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, pronounced by any assembly of divines or the decisions of any council, however venerable. In fact, there can be no irreformable dogma in any age. All dogma is reformable, and must be reformed in the progress of the Church as she advances under the guidance of the Divine Spirit toward the ultimate, the all-comprehending and all-satisfying truth.

It is necessary to distinguish between truth in itself and in its formal expression. Language is one of the noblest endowments of mankind, but it is not so noble as the mind. It is one thing for the mind to perceive the truth and to conceive the truth; it is another thing to state it in speech and in writing. The statement in human speech can only be partial, inadequate and liable to misinterpretation. If it is necessary to have infallible dogma in stereotyped, irreformable credal statements, it is also necessary to have a stereotyped irreformable Christianity and also a stereotyped, irreformable language. A Christianity that lives and grows, outlives and outgrows all ancient statements. A creed stereotypes, once for all, the faith of those who constructed it. It is an invaluable historic document. But those who use it truly do not confine themselves to its words and sentences; they study them in order to pass through the words, the sentences, the grammar, the logic, the rhetoric, to the inner sense, and so feed upon the substantial truth which they contain. We break through the shells to get at the precious kernels. We strip off the husks to get at the golden grain. We do not swallow the kernels in the shells or the grain in the husks. So we cannot feed upon the truth by merely appropriating the ancient dogmatic statements. We must break through the shells of these statements to the substantial verities.

The statements are the shells, the husks, necessary to

conserve the truth, necessary for its transmission and for its public utterance in worship; but they do not, they cannot, satisfy the soul. These must be explained, their ancient terminology has to be translated into modern phrases ere they can give nourishment to Christian life. Those who insist upon verbal inspiration of the Holy Scripture or verbal subscription to Creeds feed on shells and husks whose product is a dyspeptic and diseased Christianity.

No one knows the truth who only knows its verbal expression. A parrot may be taught that. But man has a mind to perceive and conceive what he utters, if he really knows it—this involves that he must digest it and reproduce it in forms of his own thinking and acting. He utters the words of the Creed, but they are no longer merely stereotyped words; they are illuminated and hallowed by the vital meaning given to them in Christian experience and Christian knowledge. And so the Creeds no longer mean exactly what they meant to those who composed them, but have new meanings given by the conceptions of the present generation, which envelops the Creed with its own religious experience. We cannot use old forms profitably unless we give them new meanings.

This adaptation satisfies in those historic documents where there is a consensus of Christianity, such as the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed; but it does not suffice where there is dissensus: it only makes the dissensus greater and the confusion more confounded. We ought not to be surprised, therefore, that throughout Protestantism the Protestant Confessions of Faith have been generally cast aside as inadequate, and that the movement for revision and new creeds persists in spite of every obstacle and all resistance. It must be evident to any one who knows the currents of thought which have been working during our century, and which are now working still more powerfully, that in a very few years not a single Protestant Confession of Faith or Catechism will retain binding authority in any denomination. There

is, in fact, no alternative between a rally on the Nicene Creed as proposed by the Chicago-Lambeth Conference or about those new statements of Faith which other communions are seeking. Therefore no discipline is so much needed as that of Irenics, which rises above all denominational partisanship, and sectarian bigotry, and seeks solely and alone "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth," for therein alone is peace and unity.

II. ITS SPIRIT

(1) Christian Irenics demands for its successful study, first of all, *a courageous quest for the truth.* Courage is required to rise above the prejudices of denominational or school theology. Few can do it; few will dare to do it; for the irenic theologian is charged at once with being unfaithful to his party and treacherous to his companions in arms. Many men are incapable of understanding how one can be faithful to the Westminster Confession as an excellent expression of the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture, and yet think that it may be revised, or that better and more useful statements may be made. They forget that the Westminster divines first tried to revise the Anglican Articles of Religion which they had subscribed; and then abandoned that effort and composed the Westminster Confession as a substitute for them. If the Westminster divines could honestly do that, certainly their descendants are not blameworthy in following their example, first trying in vain to revise their Confession and now seeking a new statement. There are those who think it dishonest for a Presbyterian to be anywhere else than in a Presbyterian denomination. They forget that Bishop Reynolds, one of the master spirits of the Westminster Assembly, and John Wallis, one of its clerks, led four-fifths of the Presbyterian pastors of England to abide in the Church of England, as did Cartwright and the Puritan fathers, regarding the unity of the Church of England as more important than their Presbyterian opinions.

They forget that Congregationalists and Presbyterians have been passing from the one denomination to the other for more than a century. These interchanges will become still more frequent when the denominational lines become thinner and the sectarian fences become lower. But those who identify Christianity with their sect or party will ever fight against such changes with zeal and determination.

If it is difficult and dangerous to seek a reunion of Protestants, how much more is it dangerous to venture upon a study which looks to the reunion of Protestantism with Rome and aims at nothing less than the unity of entire Christendom. The hereditary antagonism and dogmatic hostility of Protestantism bursts into flame against such an effort. I understand it well. Not a drop of blood in my veins but bounds with indignation against the wrongs suffered by my ancestors at the hands of Rome. Puritan and Huguenot, Dutch and German Reformed, all the strains in my blood cry out against priest and prelate. No man could have had a greater dogmatic hostility to Rome than I when the Vatican Council decreed papal infallibility. But, thank God, that hostility is all gone, and I now seek the reconciliation of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches. I am not unfaithful to my ancestors, or to my teachers, or to my Protestant position when I strive to rise above Protestantism to a higher and more comprehensive position in which alone reconciliation and reunion can take place. Melanchthon, the theologian of Germany, certainly had that hope, and laboured for its realisation; and other heroic men like Bucer, Calixtus, Grotius, Spinola and Leibnitz, and, I may add, Leo XIII, and also our own Schaff, in their generations, have continued to hope and labour with the conviction that, notwithstanding every obstacle and discouragement, reconciliation would eventually be accomplished.

All this is in the realm of external courage. But still greater courage is necessary to undertake to solve problems and difficulties which are generally regarded as insoluble. Many who would gladly labour for the reunion of Christen-

dom regard it as visionary and impracticable, if not impossible, and so beyond the range of useful effort.

It seems to most men presumptuous, foolhardy and perilous. And yet these hard problems must be undertaken, if Irenics is to be a useful discipline. It is useless to begin unless we have already made up our minds to honest search for the truth in all this dissensus of Christianity. But if we have made this beginning, we ought not to hesitate to make that search thorough, and to carry it through with courage. What if the reconciling word has not yet been spoken; the ideal truth which harmonises differences not yet discovered? That is no good reason why we should not pursue the quest. We know that there is such a truth and word. We know that God's Holy Spirit will eventually guide to them.

This generation has facilities of investigation not known, or only partially known, to the Fathers. Biblical Criticism has enabled us to see the Holy Scriptures in their historic origin and relations, and so has cast a flood of new light upon the Bible. Historical Criticism has given us a new Church History. Science and Philosophy have greatly enlarged and improved the area of knowledge and the methods of study. The inductive method is gradually transforming the entire range of Theology. Every problem of Theology has been put in new light. Search-lights of tremendous power sweep the entire field of history, disclosing a multitude of facts unknown to the Fathers. Criticism uses X-rays which enable us to see through obstacles impenetrable to older scholars. The microscopic investigation of the inductive method accumulates multitudes of truths entirely unknown to the men of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Irenics may use all these modern resources unknown to the Fathers, and use them without presumption, but with courage, for the successful solution of the most difficult problems, the removal of the discord and the construction of the concord of Christendom.

Brave men have no fear of obstacles: they rejoice in difficulties to be overcome. The true scholar is glad of hard problems. Has the theologian nothing to do but to work over the same questions that the fathers have solved once for all, transmitting a sacred deposit without usury? Such a task may suit quite well lazy priests and pedantic scholars, but not men of power and courage. Were it not for the enthusiasm for Christ and aspiration after God, which work mightily in the best of mankind, even under the most discouraging circumstances, Traditionalism would have long since banished true men from the Church and reduced it to an asylum for drones and imbeciles. There are problems in theology which require the highest courage and ability for their solution. There are tasks to be done that require the courage of martyrdom.

> "Thank God, no paradise stands barred
> To entry, and I find it hard
> To be a Christian." [1]

Brave scholars will eventually solve all problems, perform all tasks. It is certain that all truth will be discovered eventually—by others, if not by us. One after another difficulties disappear before courageous investigation. Every problem solved is an encouragement to solve another and an exercise in its solution. The divine Spirit will eventually lead into all the truth. The dissensus of Christianity will be decomposed, and out of it a consensus will arise as springtime from the grave of winter.

(2) Irenics, in the second place, demands *sympathy.* Irenics is the effort to discern the truth and state the reconciling word that will remove discord. It is not sufficient that we abandon polemics on the basis of the particular statement in order to study other statements, for the statements which we provisionally put aside are statements which are our own, which we have appropriated and made our

[1] Browning in *Easter Day* (end).

Christian experience. How can we study the other statements impartially by looking at them merely from the outside as theoretical truth?—for theoretical truth can never compete with experimental truth. It is necessary for us to enter into the very heart of the statements of others in order to truly know them. This may be done by the power of human sympathy. Some men are incapable of this. They cannot truly state the views of an opponent; they surely, though often unconsciously, misrepresent him. Others are so sympathetic that if they provisionally put aside their own convictions they are in peril of assuming the convictions of those with whom they come into sympathy. Undoubtedly there is peril in the sympathetic study of other statements than our own. We run the risk of being won over by our opponents. No one should attempt it who has not so mastered the position of his own Church that it possesses him, and has become a part of his very nature. Then he may bravely undertake to enter the lines of his opponents and, by the free and full exercise of his Christian sympathy, endeavour to think as they think and feel as they feel, in their worship, in their doctrines and in their life. This sympathy must be free; that is, knowing his own convictions thoroughly, he must yet be willing to yield them in whole or in part to any new truth. There must be no reservation of prejudice, bigotry or timidity. Approaching the opponents with such open-mindedness under the white flag and with the olive branch, he will be received commonly as a friend and a brother, and he will thus in a measure think and feel with them, and the truth that they have will be recognised and eliminated from the error which envelops it. He will soon learn that there is more truth in common in the opposing statements than any one supposed; that there is truth in possession of the opponent which he is glad to learn, and add to the truth which he had in possession before. He will learn with sadness that there is error and inadequacy enough, and insufficiency of statement on all sides. Such has been my experience.

Early life among the Methodists gave me a sympathy with Arminianism, although I deliberately followed Calvinism. Four years of study in Germany enabled me to sympathise with Lutheranism. Many years of labour as a Presbyterian minister and Professor of Theology enabled me to understand thoroughly the doctrine, polity and worship of the Presbyterian and other Reformed churches. Many vacations in England enabled me to overcome early prejudices against liturgy and ceremony in public worship. Several residences in Rome gave me the opportunity to enter into sympathy with Roman Catholic doctrine and worship. And so God's Holy Spirit has guided me through sympathetic study of all these divisions of Christendom to lose hostility to them, and to regard them with an irenic spirit, and with a determination to do all in my power to remove prejudices, misstatements and misinterpretations and to labour for the reunion of them all in one organic whole, the one Church of Christ.

It is impossible to understand and state with accuracy the theology of any other religious body than the one to which you belong, unless you have lived with them, and thought with them, and worshipped with them in sympathetic union. You may go to a great cathedral, admire its nave and its choir, its dome and its towers, its shapely windows and impressive gates; but no one really knows a cathedral until he has entered it with a throng of worshippers, taken part in its ceremonies and in its liturgy, and experienced that uplift of soul, that sublime unity in divine worship to which all the glories of architecture and sculpture, painting and ceremony, music and song contribute each its strain. So you cannot know any Church or denomination or sect merely from the outside. It always presents to the enemy its warlike, offensive side; to the stranger its cold exterior, even if clothed with beauty and elegance. Only the friend is admitted to the warm, cheerful, happy interior, where there is peace and unity in the home life. No one can reconcile who is not a friend of both parties. Irenics must know thoroughly

well, and in sympathetic friendship, all parties to the debate of Christianity, and all the various opinions to be harmonised.

(3) Another necessity for Irenics is *comprehensiveness.* If one would know anything thoroughly, he must know it within as well as without, and on all sides and from every point of view. One of the greatest gains in modern theology is the recognition that the several different temperaments of mankind must have each its own special phase of representation in theology; that the historic differences in the Church are due in great measure to racial peculiarities and national idiosyncrasies. Nothing of importance can be accomplished in Biblical Theology unless we recognise the different types of thinking in the biblical authors. The problem in Irenics, as in Biblical Theology, is to reconcile these differences in a higher unity; is to recognise that the temple of Christian knowledge is built up of many sides, and these not always square; of many lines, and these not always straight; of infinite complexity and intricacy of design and execution. The great Architect of the universe has not constructed the temple of wisdom in which all mankind are to worship in such a simple and uniform way that any tyro can understand it and reproduce it. He has made it for the study, the admiration, the joy of the ages, and of the noblest and best of all the ages. Men often think they know the truth if they get a sight of it from one point of view, from one angle of vision, and they resent the statements of those who have seen it from other points of view and other angles; and so their knowledge, while true and correct so far as it goes, is imperfect, inadequate and incomplete. That is really in great measure the reason of the discord of Christianity. The truth has been only partially discerned; it has not been seen in all its relations and proportions; it is not yet fully known.

When one ascends the Gorner Grat, he looks up at Monte Rosa, brilliant with everlasting snow, from base to summit, a pure priest in that ancient sanctuary of God where nature

rendered its worship ere man was born on the earth. And yet Monte Rosa does not impress him so powerfully as the massive Matterhorn or the shapely Weisshorn, and he can hardly accept the testimony that Monte Rosa is in fact the monarch of all. But if he go to the other side, descend into Italy and view Monte Rosa from the lakes or Monte Generoso! Ah! then he will see that imperial mountain rising up high above all others, the most majestic, the most commanding, the most glorious of that multitude of royal and princely snow peaks which extend in unbroken continuity far beyond the range of human vision. No one really knows Monte Rosa who has not seen it from the south. Monte Rosa is not the only thing which appears differently when viewed from the south of the Alps. There is such a thing as an ultramontane theology. No one knows Theology thoroughly, who has not studied it from the ultramontane side. We can know it thoroughly only by looking at it on all sides.

Provincial theologies have been the bane of the Christian Church since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and even mediæval peculiarities are persisted in and insisted upon still in some quarters now that we have entered the twentieth century. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries every town in Europe was walled, and every citizen might be called to arms by a night alarm to defend his household. But now those walls have been levelled with the ground, or changed into gardens and parks. They no longer exclude the stranger, but invite him. And yet in the Church the exclusive policy continues for all who cannot or will not subscribe to provincial conditions of membership. When one has abandoned the provincial point of view, and learned to look at the Church, its institutions and theology, from the point of view of the great world, he cannot regard it as of any serious consequence that he is excluded from a Lord's table which is reserved for Baptists alone; or that his piety is suspected because he cannot be a Methodist, or use the religious exercises of certain evangelists; he is not given

over to Satan if he is regarded as a heretic because he will not subscribe to a dogma held by provincial Presbyterians; or if he is censured as schismatic because he refuses a ceremony peculiar to Anglo-Catholics. His hope of salvation is not blasted if he cannot in good conscience submit to a jurisdiction recognised by Roman Catholics only.

The Church of Christ and Christian Theology, if they are to be truly Christian, must not exclude any one that is Christ's, but must include and comprehend all that is really Christian. God so loved the *world* that he gave his Son for its salvation. Christ by his incarnation identified himself with the *human race*, and therefore the Church must be a truly *œcumenical*, a world-wide Church, welcoming all men of every nation and every race into her bosom. Christian Theology should be a theology which will not repel scholars, but attract them and satisfy them, and at the same time be so clear and evident in that which it holds forth as its Creed, that the entire race of man can sincerely believe, and honestly appropriate it and practise it in their life and experience.

(4) Irenics has the noblest of tasks, the highest ideals. These cannot be accomplished so soon as one hopes. The times are in God's hands. The goal may be distant, but it is sure; it is ever near as our final aim, our highest aspiration, the beloved ideal. Therefore *patience* is essential to success in our work. Impatience impairs it, and imperils it. Think of the long-suffering and infinite patience of our God, with whom a thousand years are as a day or a watch in the night. If he were a polemic God, he would finish things in a day, exterminate a multitude of men in their wickedness and error for the salvation of an elect few possessed of truth and right. But he is an irenic God, and waits thousands of years to save not an elect few but the human race as a whole. He is slack to visit with vengeance because he is busy in redemption. With what wondrous patience Jesus Christ our Lord dealt with his disciples, and ever continues to deal with his Church! How she must

grieve his soul with her weakness and folly, her backslidings and her apostasies, her fraternal strife and failure from his ideals!

> "Patience, why, 'tis the soul of peace. Of all
> The virtues 'tis the nearest kin to heaven.
> It makes men look like gods. The best of men
> Who e'er wore earth about Him was a sufferer;
> A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit,
> The first true gentleman that ever lived." [1]

An angelic choir sang on the birthday of our Lord: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, among men in whom he is well pleased."[2] And Jesus in his farewell discourses said to his apostles: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you."[3] Have these words been but mockeries through the Christian centuries? Nay; they give the Christian ideal. God and Christ and the holy angels calmly and with divine patience await the evolution of the centuries which shall give birth to the reunion of the Church, the peace of the world, the full salvation of mankind. Therefore patience is required of any truly Irenic Theology.

The Church has not in fact overlooked its Irenic calling as the peacemaker of the world; but it has often blundered in its efforts. Unity has been sought in orthodox doctrine, in one supreme jurisdiction, in uniformity of worship, in a national religion; and intolerance to heresy, schism, dissent, has involved mankind in numberless religious wars and fraternal strifes. What matters it—the Inquisition in Rome, the Star Chamber in London, the fagot in Geneva, the prison at Leipzig, the whipping post at Salem, ostracism in Philadelphia?—they are only different forms, varying with time and circumstance, of the same intolerance which for centuries has been the bane of Christianity. An eminent Puritan of the sixteenth century, in reply to a Roman Catholic divine, who charged Protestants with being persecutors like other heretics, said in 1580: "Nay—they punish none but filthy

[1] Thomas Dekker. [2] Luke ii. 14. [3] John xiv. 27.

idle idolaters and hypocrites."[1] Such a spirit justifies the persecution of any religious opponent. Many generations of civil wars and religious controversy were necessary in Great Britain to bring about toleration of dissent from the national Churches. The United States was the first nation to try the experiment of religious equality at the expense of a national Church and a national religion. We are still in the experimental stage with it. Our century has shown great advances toward Church Unity. The German Reformed and Lutherans came together and constituted the Evangelical Church of Germany. The Anglican Church has proposed the Quadrilateral of unity to the Christian world. Leo XIII has written several irenical letters. "Come, let us reason together," he has said. And the Anglican archbishops and the Oriental patriarchs have reasoned with him. They have not yet found the basis of Unity; but they have greatly narrowed the lines of division, and Christian love has overflowed these lines.

We must have patience still. The Fathers waited patiently for centuries while they made their mistaken efforts. Let us avoid their mistakes and continue their efforts. We may have long to wait; but not so long as they. We are nearer the goal. Great world-wide movements are now at work behind and beneath all human efforts. They are the impulses of the Divine Spirit breaking up the crust of the existing divisions to fuse them into a new, greater and more glorious Christianity. They are the heart-beats of the Church of Christ, which is moved as never before by a sensitiveness to all that transpires in her members, even in the humblest and feeblest and most despised parts, and by an inappeasable longing for the unity and harmony of the entire organism of Christianity, and by a presage in holy love of the chosen of the Lord that her Bridegroom is near.

(5) We may have gone thus far in Irenics with entire success, and with complete accuracy, but something is still needed to accomplish that concord and unity which is our

[1] Fulke's "Discovery," 1580, p. 313.

final goal. A supreme motive, an invincible impulse is indispensable for so great a work; nothing else, and nothing other than Christian *love*—that love which moved the Father to give His Son for the world; that love which moved the Son to die for our salvation; that love which seeks not its own, which is not easily provoked, which rises above faith and its doctrines, hope and its ambitions, which covers a multitude of sins, which sees with inerrant vision all that is good and true, and which organises them into a living, loving and glorious whole. Love is the great material principle of Irenics, which will as surely effect the Reunion of the Church as faith accomplished its Reformation

II

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

THERE are existing in the Church at the present time, as there have been for centuries, a number of varying speculative theories about the Church. These theories are represented in a number of parties or schools. They all claim to adhere to the Biblical doctrine of the Church, and they are doubtless sincere in the claim. In fact, all of these parties and schools have unfolded the Biblical doctrine by logical deduction and practical application, and have used other sources than the Bible for this purpose. This is quite legitimate. The "Chicago-Lambeth Articles" state that the historical episcopate should "be locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of the Church"; but that is true also as to every other part of the doctrine of the Church. It should be in all respects locally and temporally adapted. Parties and schools are the instruments in the hands of the divine Spirit for making experiments in adaptation, in testing and verifying theories, as the Church advances in her mission in this world.

I shall not attempt to give the Church doctrine of the Church. The Church doctrine of the Church is defined in the Creeds, Liturgies and confessional books of the several organised communions in Christendom. This doctrine is based on Holy Scripture; but it is also based on traditions transmitted in historic succession from the teachings and institutions in the great apostolic sees of Rome, Alexandria, Ephesus, Antioch and Jerusalem. This doctrine is also a resultant of the logical unfolding of Biblical and traditional doctrine in its adaptation to different nations

and epochs. All this Church doctrine may be implicitly involved in the doctrine of Holy Scripture, may be a legitimate, logical deduction and practical application of Biblical material. But it is not Biblical doctrine. The Biblical doctrine is strictly limited to the express statements of Holy Scripture. To this express teaching I shall limit myself.

The Biblical doctrine of the Church cannot be ascertained by a merely superficial citation of proof-texts from King James' Version, or even from the Greek Textus Receptus and the Massoretic text of the Old Testament; all of which contain later accretions and dislocations of Biblical material. I shall endeavour to give the Biblical doctrine as based on a rigorous and thorough criticism of the Biblical material.

The New Testament Doctrine of the Church, like most New Testament doctrines, is built on Old Testament doctrine. Those who attempt to understand New Testament doctrine by itself alone may be compared to those who look at a beautiful castle whose foundations, supporting hillsides and adjoining valleys are all shrouded in mist and cloud. We shall begin the study of the New Testament doctrine of the Church by presenting the Old Testament foundations. The New Testament doctrine of the Church was constructed by using the technical, historical terms, prepared by divine providence in the Old Testament dispensation.

I. THE TERM CHURCH

The most important term is *ἐκκλησία*, rendered by "church" in the English New Testament. The late Dr. Hort thinks that the words "church" and "congregation," both legitimate renderings of *ἐκκλησία*, have been so involved in later partisan conceptions that it is impracticable to attain the pure Biblical idea of *ἐκκλησία* without discarding them and transliterating by *ecclesia* itself.[1] I agree with him as to the facts of the case. But this situation is a common one in Biblical Theology. The method which I have endeavoured

[1] *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 2.

to pursue, in all my use of technical Biblical terms in Biblical Theology, is a different one, namely, to purge the Biblical words of their later partisan bias and theoretic accretions, and set them in their genuine Biblical light and colour. Our battleships are not discarded when their bottoms have been fouled by tropical marine deposits. We put them in the dry-docks and clean them, and they become as powerful and useful as ever.

1. For the study of *ἐκκλησία* we get little light from classic Greek. Thayer-Grimm says: "Among the Greeks, from Thucydides down (it means), an assembly of the people convened at the public place of council for the purpose of deliberating." It is used in this sense, in the New Testament, only in Acts xix. 32, 39, 41. In the Greek versions, the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, it translates usually the Hebrew קָהָל. This Hebrew קהל is, however, more comprehensive than *ἐκκλησία*. It has the same fundamental meaning of "assembly," but this may be of an army, a crowd, a band of robbers, as well as a political and religious assembly. It also means the act of assembling and the body itself as assembled. In the Pentateuch, the earliest part of the Old Testament translated into Greek, קהל is rendered by the Greek *συναγωγή* in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. These are the chief passages in the Law where the Hebrew religious community, organised and meeting for worship, is described. Deuteronomy has a different usage; *ἐκκλησία* is used for קהל in all passages (Deut. ix. 10; x. 4; xviii. 16; xxiii. 1, 2, 3, 8; xxxi. 30) but one (v. 19 [22]), where *συναγωγή* is used. This shows for Deuteronomy the hand of another and later translator than for the other books of the Pentateuch. The phrase, *ἐκκλησία Κυρίου* (*i. e.*, Yahweh), begins in Deut. xxiii. 1 (2), 2 (3), 3 (4), 8 (9).

In the Prophets, the second layer of the canon, קהל is rendered by *συναγωγή* in Jeremiah and Ezekiel often; in Isaiah the word is not used. But in the translation of the Minor Prophets *ἐκκλησία* is used in the two passages, Micah ii. 5;

Joel ii. 16—the only ones in the collection using קהל. In the prophetic histories in all passages the same translation by *ἐκκλησία* is made. It is interesting to note, however, that G^A gives *ἐκκλησία* in one passage, Ezek. xxxii. 3; Aquila in five passages, Ezek. xxiii. 47; xxvi. 7; xxxii. 3, 22, 23; and Theodotion in six passages, Ezek. xxiii. 47; xxvi. 7; xxvii. 27; xxxii. 3, 22, 23, showing an increasing tendency in later times to the use of *ἐκκλησία*. This is confirmed by the translator of the chronicler, who in thirty-eight passages uses *ἐκκλησία* for קהל. So also in the Psalter *ἐκκλησία* is used eight times; in Proverbs once; in Job once; *συναγωγή* is used only in Ps. xl. 11 (10), and Prov. xxi. 16, for special reasons.

It is evident, therefore, that in the earlier translations of the Old Testament into Greek קהל was rendered by *συναγωγή*, in the later translated by *ἐκκλησία*. We are thus at the very foundations of our study brought face to face with the fact that *συναγωγή* was an older Greek term than *ἐκκλησία* for Israel as an organized religious body, and so we should not be surprised that it has continued among the Jews to the present time. The collective Israel is now, as ever since the Pentateuch was translated into Greek, known as "the Synagogue." The collective Christianity has been known as "the Church," the earlier Christians preferring this term to "synagogue." The two terms are, indeed, synonymous terms, with little practical difference in meaning.

More common in the Pentateuch than קהל is עדה, "congregation, company assembled by appointment," used 115 times in the priest's code, and translated by *συναγωγή*. There are two passages in which עדה and קהל are used together (Exod. xii. 6; Numb. xiv. 5), translated in Greek by one word, *συναγωγή*. Probably these are conflations.

We thus have in the Old Testament the use of עדה and קהל, terms to indicate the entire religious community of Israel. These were rendered by "synagogue" and "church." *Συναγωγή* came first to have a local sense of a single community, and thus probably *ἐκκλησία* became more common

among the Greek Jews for Israel as a whole, although the Palestinian Jews adhered to the older word. It was natural, therefore, for Christians to use *ἐκκλησία* by preference, which itself was also used for the local assembly as well as the whole body. This double sense of both words was established in the Old Testament.

2. The New Testament doctrine of the *ἐκκλησία* must be built on the teaching of Paul. There are only three cases in the Gospels in which the word *ἐκκλησία* is put in the mouth of Jesus, viz., Matt. xvi. 17–19; xviii. 15–20. It is improbable that in either case Jesus used the Aramaic קהלא. It seems altogether probable that he used in the former case "kingdom" or "house," for either of these words is more in accordance with the context, and the imagery of the passage and later references to it. In the latter case "the disciples" or "brotherhood" was probably used for a similar reason. Jesus, as we shall see later on, used "kingdom" where Paul used *ἐκκλησία*.[1]

3. The use of *ἐκκλησία* apart from Paul and his disciples is confined to James v. 14; Rev. i. 4—iii. 22, nineteen times; Rev. xxii. 16; III John 6, 9, 10; always of the local *ἐκκλησία*, where *συναγωγή* would have been equally appropriate.

4. *Ἐκκλησία* is used in the book of Acts twenty-three times. In three of these the reference is to the Greek assembly (viz., xix. 32, 39, 41), as we have seen; six to the church in Jerusalem (viii. 1, 3; xi. 22; xii. 1, 5; xv. 4); four to the church at Antioch (xi. 26; xiii. 1; xiv. 27; xv. 3); one each to the church at Ephesus (xx. 17) and at Cæsarea (xviii. 22); thrice to a number of churches in different cities (xiv. 23; xv. 41; xvi. 5).

Several passages need special attention. The phrase "the whole Church," Acts v. 11; xv. 22, seems to comprehend the whole Christian body. So also "the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria," Acts ix. 31; for Christianity had not extended farther at that time. Stephen,

[1] See Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 190 f.

Acts vii. 38, refers to the "Church in the wilderness," plainly indicating the continuity of the Church of his day with the Church of that day. But the most important passage is Acts xx. 28, where Paul warns the elders of the church at Ephesus: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he acquired with his own blood."

As I have said elsewhere:

"There is a great difference of opinion as to the reading here. The external authority of MSS., versions and citations is not decisive. Tischendorf, DeWette, Meyer, and the mass of German critics read 'Church of the Lord'; Scrivener, Westcott and Hort, and the leading British scholars read 'Church of God.' If any unprejudiced man will compare the great mass of authorities cited on both sides, he will be convinced that there is ample room for difference of opinion. The context favours 'Church of the Lord.' This reading is also favoured by the fact that it is a unique reading and, therefore, difficult. Nowhere else in the New Testament do we find the phrase 'Church of the Lord.' The scribe in doubt would follow the usual phrase. 'The Church of the Lord' is only found here in the New Testament, but it is the same in idea as the Church of which Christ is the head, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians. 'The Church of God' is a favourite expression of Paul in his epistles. Indeed, the word 'church' is a Pauline word. In his theology it takes the place of the kingdom of the gospels and of the Jewish Christian writers. 'The Church of the Lord' has been acquired as a possession by him. The means by which this precious acquisition has been made is his blood. This blood, according to the reading which has been adopted, is the blood of the Messiah. We are reminded of redemption by the blood of Christ, the lamb without blemish and without spot, of the first Epistle of Peter. Here, as there, the blood is doubtless the blood of the sacrifice of the new covenant as represented in the cup of the Lord's Supper. Parallel with the Church is the flock. This parallelism is favoured by the words of Jesus which connect flock and kingdom, and it is in accordance with the teachings of Jesus when he appointed his apostles to act as shepherds of the flock. The Church of the Lord is the flock of the Messiah which is to be fed by shepherds appointed by him. These shepherds were constituted by the Holy Spirit, so that they are shepherds of the flock of Christ, by the authority of Christ. The elders of the local church at Ephesus are addressed, according to the context. The apostle rises from the conception of the local church and flock to the universal Church and flock, and recog-

nises that the elders of the local church are shepherds of the universal Church of the Lord. They are overseers, who have the flock in charge. The elders are bishops in the church."[1]

Dr. Hort calls attention to the fact that Paul here has in mind Ps. lxxiv. 2, where the Septuagint uses *συναγωγή*, and that Paul does not hesitate to substitute *ἐκκλησία* for it.

"Of course, in strictness the words belong only to the one universal Christian ecclesia; but here they are transferred to the individual ecclesia of Ephesus, which alone these elders were charged to shepherd. In the epistles we shall find similar investment of parts of the universal ecclesia with the high attributes of the whole. This transference is no mere figure of speech. Each partial society is set forth as having a unity of its own, and, being itself a body made up of many members, has therefore a corporate life of its own; and yet these attributes could not be ascribed to it as an absolutely independent and, as it were, insular society; they belong to it only as a representative member of the great whole."[2]

This passage just considered, in which Luke puts the word *ἐκκλησία Κυρίου* in the mouth of Paul, may introduce us to Paul's doctrine of the *ἐκκλησία*. We may study it in its three stages of growth in the Pauline epistles: (1) in the earlier group of epistles, Galatians, I and II Thessalonians, I and II Corinthians, Romans; (2) in the epistles written during the Roman captivity, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon; and (3) in the pastoral epistles, I and II Timothy, Titus.

(1) The term "church" is used three times in Galatians, four times in Thessalonians, thirty-one times in Corinthians and five times in Romans. In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul speaks of the local assembly or synagogue (i. 2, 22); but also of these local churches as in Christ (i. 22), and of the organised body of Christians as the Church of God which he had persecuted (i. 13). Paul does not in the Epistles to the Thessalonians rise above the local assembly or synagogue, but he teaches that these local assemblies are

[1] Briggs, *The Messiah of the Apostles*, 1895, pp. 80–83.
[2] *The Christian Ecclesia*, 1898, pp. 102–3.

organised *in* God the Father (I Thess. i. 1; II Thess. i. 1), and that they are churches belonging to God, in union and communion with God (I Thess. ii. 14; II Thess. i. 4). This is based on the Old Testament usage of the Church of Yahweh (*ἐκκλησία Κυρίου*).

In the Epistles to the Corinthians Paul commonly refers to the local church, especially to the local church at Corinth, to which he writes as an organised assembly of Christians, I Cor. i. 2; vi. 4; xiv. 4, 5, 12, 23; II Cor. i. 1; and also as assembled in a local sense, I Cor. xi. 18, 22; xiv. 19, 28, 35; xvi. 19. He also speaks of the churches of Galatia, I Cor. xvi. 1; of Asia, I Cor. xvi. 19; of Macedonia, II Cor. viii. 1; of local churches without name, I Cor. iv. 17; vii. 17; xi. 16; xiv. 33, 34; II Cor. viii. 18, 19, 23, 24; xi. 8, 28; xii. 13. These churches are, on the one side, churches of God (I Cor. i. 2, xi. 16; II Cor. i. 1) and, on the other, churches of saints (I Cor. xiv. 33, "consecrated, holy ones"). But Paul also conceives of the whole body of Christians as "the Church of God." It was this Church that he persecuted (I Cor. xv. 9), and this Church that we are to consider in not giving occasion of stumbling (x. 32). In the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul conceives of the Church as endowed by God with a ministry. God Himself hath set in the Church the apostles, prophets, teachers, powers, gifts of healing, helps, governments, kinds of tongues (xii. 28). It is evident that he is not thinking of an order of the ministry in a later sense, but of special graces given by God to certain men whom He has given to the Church for its edification. He thinks of this Church thus endowed as the body of Christ. The body is here conceived under the image of a human body with a human head. Christ is the head, all Christians are members of his body, having a diversity of gifts. There are feet, ear, eye, nose, feeble and uncomely parts, comely parts. There should be no schism in the body. "In one Spirit we were all baptised into the one body." It is, therefore, not an invisible organism; it is a visible organisation. There must be harmony and co-

operation of all members—no schism on the one side, and no dishonouring of weak and uncomely parts on the other.

In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul speaks of the church in Cenchreæ (xvi. 1); a local church (xvi. 5); churches (xvi. 4); churches of Christ (xvi. 16); the whole church of which Gaius was a minister (xvi. 23). The only additional phrase is "church *of* Christ" in place of "Church *of* God" of the other epistles.

(2) The doctrine of the Church in the epistles of the imprisonment shows a decided advance. There is little reference to local churches. Paul speaks of churches in general (Phil. iv. 15); the church in Laodicea (Col. iv. 15, 16); a local church (Philem. 2). The doctrine of the whole Church is in the apostle's mind. He recalls that he persecuted the Church (Phil. iii. 6); God gave Christ to be head over all things to the Church (Eph. i. 22); Christ is especially head of the Church (v. 23); the Church is subject to Christ (v. 24); Christ loves the Church and gave himself up for it (v. 25); Christ nourisheth it (v. 29); God is to receive glory in the Church (iii. 21); the mystery of Christ and the Church is great (v. 32); the Church makes known the manifold wisdom of God to the angels (iii. 10); Christ is to present it to himself a glorious Church (v. 27); he is head of the body, the Church (Col. i. 18); his body is the Church (i. 24). In these epistles Christ is conceived as enthroned in heaven as the head of the Church and as the head over all things to the Church. The Church is subject to him as wife to husband. He loves it, gave himself for it, and nourisheth it, and will eventually present it to himself a glorious Church. The Church on earth is to glorify God, and the Church in heaven will make known the manifold wisdom of God to the angels.

(3) The use of *ἐκκλησία* in the pastoral epistles is confined to the first Epistle to Timothy. "Let not the church be burdened" (I Tim. v. 16), doubtless refers to the local church. The church of God, of which the bishop is to take care (I Tim. iii. 5), may be the local church, as it is parallel with

his own house. But the church of the living God (I Tim. iii. 15) must be the whole Church.

"The apostle advises Timothy 'how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.' The house of God is here, as in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the household of God, the family of which God is the father. As the household there was parallel with commonwealth and temple, so here it is the Church of the living God. The Church of the living God takes the place of the Church of God of the earlier Paulinism, and the Church of the later Paulinism. God is the living God here in order that the Church may be conceived of as a living Church, composed of living men, behaving themselves properly in the family of God. A living Church is similar to the living temple of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Church is conceived of as the pillar and ground or stay of the truth. This is a later conception of the Church. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the temple was composed of living stones and of living buildings. The stones and the buildings were parts of the structure. Here the whole Church is conceived of as a pillar on which the truth is lifted up and as a ground or stay upon which it rests. The figure is probably that of a platform or basis supported by a pillar. The Church is this basis and its pillar. The truth is that which rests upon this base, and is lifted up before the world on it. The truth that is thus lifted up and supported is the living truth; it is the mystery of godliness; it is the Messiah himself, as set forth in the lines of an ancient credal hymn, which follows. It is possible that the writer has in mind the Messianic conception of the Old Testament that the Messiah is the cope-stone which finishes the structure of the new temple, which is brought forth with shoutings, 'Grace, grace unto it.' The Messiah as the cope-stone here would be the antithesis to the Messiah as the corner-stone of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Messiah, thus exalted as the cope-stone, the head of the Church, is the revelation of the mystery of God."[1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews may be added here, not as written by Paul, but as having a conception nearer to the later Paulinism. Heb. ii. 12 quotes Ps. xxii. 23 (22), and so represents the New Testament Church and the Old Testament Church as one in praising God. Heb. xii. 23 represents the Church of the first-born, the martyrs, as a heavenly Church.

[1] *The Messiah of the Apostles*, 1895, pp. 228, 229.

We may now sum up the Pauline use of *ἐκκλησία*: It is the Church *of* God, *of* the living God, *of* Christ, *of* the Lord, as *in* God the Father and *in* Christ. It is the body of Christ over which Christ reigns in love and in nourishing care. The Church holds him up as her truth. The Church is a Church of saints on earth and of the first-born martyrs in heaven. The earthly Church glorifies God. The heavenly Church tells angels the manifold wisdom of God. The Church of the New Testament is the historical continuation of the Church of the Old Testament. The entrance to the Church is by baptism in the Spirit. Its officers are given by God. The one Church embraces a number of local churches, in different cities and provinces. The Church is one. Nowhere is there more than one church in one place. The local church is the representative of the whole Church in the particular city. The Church is divine—it is *in* God and Christ and the divine Spirit. It is holy—it is composed of baptised and consecrated ones. It is one with the Old Testament Church and with the heavenly Church. There is nothing to justify the distinction between an invisible and a visible Church.

II. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

As we have proceeded, it has become evident that we cannot limit the New Testament doctrine of the Church to the use of the word *ἐκκλησία*. Other terms are constantly appearing in the parallelism of the writings. These terms are also, in all cases, Old Testament terms. The most important of these is *kingdom of God* (*βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*). This is the earliest word in the Old Testament used of Israel as an organization. It is found in a poetic source of the Ephraemitic story of the Exodus (Exod. xix. 6). God says to Israel: "*Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests*" (ממלכת כהנים). The nation as a whole, in its unity as an organisation, is constituted by God at once a kingdom and a priesthood, a royal priesthood and a priestly kingdom.

This was not the establishment of a dynasty of kings. That came later in the dynasty of David. It was not the institution of a hierarchy of priests. That also came later in the hierarchies of Levi and Aaron. But the whole nation as an organism was constituted a kingdom and instituted a priesthood under God their king. This conception of Israel as a kingdom of God persists in the poetry and prophecy of the Old Testament. The Messianic prediction conceives of the Messiah as the king of the kingdom, in whom the dynasty of David and the royalty of Yahweh alike culminate.

It was, therefore, eminently natural and proper that Jesus the Messiah should use the term "kingdom" for the organisation he came to establish in the world. The kingdom in the teaching of Jesus is both historical and eschatological. As historical, it is the kingdom of grace in this world; as eschatological, it is the kingdom of glory either in heaven or of the last days which follow the second advent of our Lord. On Peter as the rock this kingdom is to be built. Peter has the keys to open its gates and to close them. The gates of Hades will not prevail over this kingdom; it is eternal (Matt. xvi. 17–19[1]). This kingdom had its historical beginning in heaven when Jesus ascended and sat down on his throne at the right hand of the Father, welcomed by all heaven as the Lion of Judah (Rev. v). It began on earth when the Holy Spirit descended on the day of Pentecost and organised the kingdom. Peter thus interpreted the event when he said:

"This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens; but he saith himself, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet."' Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom ye crucified." (Acts ii. 32–36).

[1] *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 324 f., where all the passages in the gospels are discussed.

From this time on throughout the New Testament writings Jesus is not only the Messiah, the king; but he is also called Lord, a term which in the Jewish usage is applied to God, but which in Christian usage is applied almost exclusively in the New Testament to Jesus Christ.[1]

Peter in his first epistle applies the fundamental passage of the Old Testament, as to the kingdom of priests, to the Christian body when he writes:

"But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for (God's) own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: which in time past were no people, but now are the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy" (I Peter ii. 9–10).

It is evident that Peter sees the entire Christian community as the royal priesthood of the Old Testament institution, now under the reigning king and high priest Jesus the Messiah.

All faithful Israel carried over the kingdom of God of the Old Dispensation into the kingdom of God under the New Dispensation. The unfaithful Jews were as truly excluded from that kingdom for their unbelief and refusal to recognise the Messianic king, as were Esau and his descendants in patriarchal times, and the Samaritan schism in post-exilic times. The Church of Christ is the kingdom of God, and there is no other kingdom of God under the New Testament dispensation. The kingdom of Christ is in true historical continuity to the kingdom of God of the Old Testament. It abides in the world as the kingdom of grace; it continues in the heavens and subsequent to the second advent as the kingdom of glory. This is the kingdom over which Christ reigns as Lord, according to Paul, having "the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father"

[1] *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 86 f.

(Phil. ii. 9–11). "For he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet" (I Cor. xv. 25).

It is evident from Paul's use of the terms "lordship" and "reign" of Christ, that he conceives of the organized Christian community as a kingdom, just as the other New Testament writers do. But, in fact, Paul always uses the term "kingdom" in an eschatological sense, and uses "church" for the Christian organisation in this world.[1] It is quite significant that those New Testament writings which use "kingdom" for the Christian organization in this world, such as the four gospels, I Peter, the earlier Hebrew apocalypses, do not use the word "church"; while the epistles of Paul, and James, and the apocalypse of the Epistles, which emphasise "church," use "kingdom" in an eschatological sense. There is a mixed usage only in the book of Acts, which may be due to the variation between sources and authors. It is interesting also to note that the Epistle to the Hebrews uses "kingdom" for the organisation in this world (Heb. xii. 28), but "church" only for the Old Testament organisation and the assembly of the martyrs in heaven. It is evident, therefore, that there is a documentary difference in the use of the terms "kingdom" and "church" in the New Testament, and therefore we should be cautious in drawing distinctions between them.

I may say that I have carefully examined all the uses of these and cognate terms in both Testaments, and as a result of my investigations I declare that nothing can be more false than the distinction between "kingdom" and "church" asserted by many moderns. These are chiefly men who are displeased with the historic Church and seek refuge in the kingdom as taught by Jesus Christ, in the conceit that this is something larger and better. In fact, "church" and "kingdom" differ only as synonymous terms. There is nothing of importance which can be asserted of the kingdom of God which may not be also asserted of the Church of God, if we faithfully use Biblical material without specula-

[1] *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 538 f.

tion and theorising. Jesus is king of the kingdom, and he reigns over it, subduing all external enemies under his feet, or transforming them by his grace into citizens of his kingdom. He is also the head over all things to his Church. The Church and the kingdom are coextensive; both are Old Testament institutions and New Testament institutions; both are institutions of this world, and both are eternal institutions of the world to come; both are organisations in the midst of the world and of the universe; both will eventually subdue and absorb the world and also the universe; the one is as spiritual as the other, the one is as external as the other.

III. OTHER BIBLICAL TERMS FOR CHURCH

1. The term "people" is equal in antiquity to the term "kingdom." It is found in the same poetic source of the Ephraemitic writer already mentioned; it is also in the ancient lyrics, and is a favourite conception of Deuteronomy and the earlier prophets. The fundamental thought connected with the term "people" is redemption. "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples" (Exod. xix. 5); "the people thou hast gotten" (Exod. xv. 16); "Yahweh's portion is his people; Jacob the lot of his inheritance" (Deut. xxxii. 9). It is found in that grand picture of the consolidation of the nations under Yahweh's dominion given in Isaiah: "Israel shall be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth: for that Yahweh Sebaoth hath blessed them, saying, 'Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my inheritance'" (Isa. xix. 24, 25). Little use is made of this conception of people in connection with the Christian community, doubtless because it implies at the bottom a national particularism, done away with in the New Dispensation. The term is used just enough to show that the Christian community inherits the Old Testament continuity in this regard. So Peter says, in the passage already cited, that Christians are "a people for (God's) own pos-

session"; "which in time past were no people, but now are the people of God" (I Peter ii, 9, 10). And in the Epistle to Titus it is said: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works" (Titus ii. 14). So Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians (vi. 16) uses the sacred term "Israel of God" for the Christian community.

2. The prophet Isaiah uses the image of the "vine" in a vineyard to set forth the conception of the relation of Yahweh to his people (Isa. v. 1–7), and this becomes a still more beautiful symbol in the eightieth Psalm. No wonder that it became a favourite symbol for carving upon the entrance to Jewish synagogues. Jesus uses it to set forth the vital organic relation between himself and his disciples. "I am the vine—ye are the branches," said the Master (John xv. 5). The prophet Ezekiel (xvii. 22–24) uses a similar image when he selects the cedar of Lebanon, and Jesus when he selects the mustard plant (Matt. xiii. 31, 32), and Paul when he uses the olive tree (Rom. xi. 17–24). There are, in the organised body of Christians, the vital source in Christ, the organic common life, and the continuity of growth that are seen in the plant and the tree.

3. The prophet Ezekiel (xxxiv. 1–31) uses the image of the "flock and shepherd." This became a favourite conception of the psalmists (Pss. lxxx., xcv., c.; Isa. xl. 10–11). It was used by Jesus (Luke xv. 3–7; John x. 1–30) and by Paul (Acts xx. 28, 29). Jesus commissions Peter to feed his flock (John xxi. 15–17). It then became one of the favourites of the early Christians, the most frequent of all in the martyr age, when they painted and carved this conception in the Roman catacombs. Jesus teaches that there is but one flock, and that, while some sheep may be scattered and lost, it is the work of the shepherd, not to organise them into separate flocks, but to bring them back to the one flock, that there may be "one flock, one shepherd" (John x. 16).

4. One of the most frequent conceptions of the organised

community in the Old Testament times is that of "the city of God." This conception sprang up when the kingdom had virtually been reduced to the city of Jerusalem and its environs, so that practically city and kingdom were one and the same. It is Jeremiah who first sees the holy city of the restoration and pictures it as more sacred than the ancient ark of the covenant, bearing the name "Yahweh our righteousness," holy in its entire suburbs (Jer. iii. 17; xxxiii. 16; xxxi. 38–40). Ezekiel names the city "Yahweh is there" (Ezek. xlviii. 35). The great prophet of the exile predicts that it will be rebuilt of precious stones, its gates salvation, its walls praise. It will be the light and glory of the world, and bear the name "Married" and "My delight is in thee." It will be the centre of a new earth and new heaven (Isa. xlix. 23; liv. 12; lvi. 7; lx., lxii.; lxv. 17–19). One of the later prophets predicts that the New Jerusalem will be so holy that the bells of the horses and cooking utensils will bear the same inscription as the tiara of the high priest, "Holy to Yahweh" (Zech. xiv. 20, 21).

The Psalter uses the term for the existing community, although the ideal ever mingles with the real:

"His brooks make glad the city of Yahweh,
The holy place of the tabernacle of Yahweh 'Elyon.
Yahweh is in her midst, she cannot be made to totter;
Yahweh will help her, at the turn of the morn" (Ps. xlvi. 5–6).

"Great and highly to be praised in the city is our God.
His holy mount is beautiful in elevation, the joy of the whole earth;
Mount Zion on the northern ridge is a royal city.
Yahweh doth strive in her citadels, is known for a high tower."
(Ps. xlviii. 2–4.)[1]

This idea of the city is specially brought out in the eighty-seventh Psalm, the one called by Delitzsch "the city of the regeneration of the nations." Thus Old Testament prophetic

[1] The translations are those of my *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, I. pp. 393, 400, II. 239.

usage justifies the use of the city, in the New Testament, in the eschatological sense. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians (iv. 21–31) contrasts the Jerusalem that now is, the city of the Law, with the Jerusalem above, the mother of all believers. In the Epistle to the Philippians he says: "For our commonwealth is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour" (Phil. iii. 20). The Epistle to the Hebrews represents that Christians have come, not to Mount Sinai, but "unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb. xii. 22).

The apocalypse of the Bowls represents the New Jerusalem as descending from God out of heaven at the second advent, glorious as an immense diamond, with twelve foundations inscribed with the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb; and the apocalypse of the Dragon describes it as coming down as a bride adorned for her husband, with foundations of twelve most precious stones, and gates of pearl and streets of gold, four square as the holy of holies of the ancient temple (Rev., chap. xxi).[1]

But the usage of the Psalter makes it proper to conceive of the Christian community in the world as also a city of God. This is the term which Augustine used in his great classic *De civitate Dei.* It is also justified by Paul's words in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where he represents that the Gentiles who were "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel" "are made nigh in the blood of Christ," so that they are "no more strangers," but are "fellow-citizens with the saints" (Eph. ii. 12–22). And so Christian poetry has ever delighted to sing of the Church as the city of God. In fact, the Church is the city of God in the world, and also in a large sense the city of God in the heavenly world where Christ is enthroned with the departed saints and angels.

5. Still more important, in many respects, is the conception of the Christian community as "the house or temple of God." This is involved often in the prophetic pictures of the city, because the entire city becomes, as it were, a temple.

[1] *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 363 f., 431 f.

But the conception of temple has its specific ideals and relations. The corner-stone and the cope-stone are prophetic images in Isaiah, Zechariah and the Psalter to indicate the one sure foundation and the one certain completion of the structure. Both of these are applied to Christ in the New Testament, both by the Master himself and by Peter and Paul. But still more important is the evolution of the holy temple of the New Dispensation, especially in the prophecies of Ezekiel.[1] Jesus, according to the Gospel of John, represented that when he rose from the dead he would himself be the temple of the New Dispensation (John ii. 18–22). Paul elaborated the conception of the Christian temple as he did that of the Christian ἐκκλησία. He now represents that the individual Christian is the temple of God, then that the local Christian community is the temple of God, and finally that the whole Christian organism is the temple of God. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (I Cor. iii. 16), he says to the Corinthian community. "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you?" (I Cor. vi. 19), he says to the individual Christian. Then, addressing the whole Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he writes:

"Being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 20–22).

The whole Christian community is thus the very temple of God. Christ is the ever-living corner-stone. About him are the living foundations, the apostles and prophets of the New Testament dispensation. This is an elaboration of the prediction of Jesus that St. Peter was to be the rock of the house. The corner-stone and the foundations are all laid, the structure itself rises, it grows as a living temple. Every stone is living, every building is living, the whole struc-

[1] Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 479–480.

ture is living and growing. It is not yet completed, but is sure to be completed according to the ideals of the master. It is a dwelling of God in the Spirit. The Spirit of God animates it with life and growth. Here St. Paul conceives of the Christian community in its entirety as possessed by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit inhabits each one, and inhabits, organises, and gives growth and harmony to the whole.

St. Peter has the same conception where he says: "If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious; unto whom coming, a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (I Peter ii. 3–5). Here priesthood and sacrifice are attached to the entire Christian community as well as to the living Christ, and they are all attached naturally and necessarily to the conception of the Christian community as a real, living temple of God. Nothing needs to be emphasized and unfolded in connection with the doctrine of the Christian Church so much as just this idea, that it is a holy temple of priesthood and sacrifice inhabited by the divine Spirit. This is just the conception of Church to which we are being guided in our day as the one most appropriate for our times.

6. Another conception which plays an important part in the New Testament, and which is prepared in the Old Testament, is that the religious organisation is a "household or family" of God. This begins with the thought of the Judaic writer of the Pentateuch where he represents God as saying, "Israel is my son, my first-born" (Exod. iv. 22). Israel as an organisation is the son of God. This conception is also found in the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 6). It is used in the generic sense in Hosea and the prophets that follow him.

In the teaching of Jesus for the first time the conception of fatherhood is distributed to individuals. This was first possible when Jesus as the incarnate Saviour showed himself to be the Son of the Father and taught his disciples that God was

also the father of each and all of them. Paul represents that the Spirit of God gives believers the spirit of adoption in which they recognise God as their father and themselves as joint heirs with Christ (Rom. viii. 14–17). Christ united Jew and Gentile into one household, or family of God (Eph. ii. 19). God is the father of all fatherhoods (Eph. iii. 14–17). He is the universal father, under whose paternal authority all men and angels are grouped in fatherhoods, just as Israel was in the Old Testament dispensation. This does not imply that all men and angels are in this sense children of God. There is, indeed, a sense in which God is the universal father of all His creation. But the fatherhood of which we are speaking is the fatherhood by adoption, fatherhood of grace; a fatherhood, a sonship and a brotherhood which are peculiar to the redeemed, and which belong exclusively to the Christian community. John conceives of this fatherhood and sonship and brotherhood in the Christian family as all summed up in love. This conception of the Church as a family of God, a brotherhood, is a favourite one in modern times, especially among our Congregational brethren.

7. The religious community of the Old Testament is frequently conceived of, from the time of the prophet Hosea onward, as the "wife of Yahweh." The prophets Zephaniah, Jeremiah and the great prophet of the exile exult in the relation of love, and strain their imaginations to picture it in terms of beauty and grandeur and pathetic tenderness.[1] The same conception is taken up in the New Testament, where Paul represents the Church as the bride of Christ (Eph. v. 23–32), and in the Apocalypse, where the Christian community is the bride of the Saviour (Rev. xxi. 2–9).

8. The conception of the incarnation, as it unfolds to St. Paul, involves a closer union between Christ and his people than any thus far considered, a union of vital organisation, a racial identification. For this purpose the "human body" is used as the image. Christ is the head of the Church conceived as a body. But, more than that: Christians are

[1] See my *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 482 f.

Christ's bodily members (I Cor. vi. 15; Eph. v. 30). For this latter passage, a gloss in many ancient manuscripts adds "of his flesh and of his bones." The nearest approach to this conception in the Old Testament is in that great apocalypse, Isaiah xxiv.–xxvii., where Israel is called by Yahweh "My corpse" (Isa. xxvi. 19), which He will therefore raise to national life again. So Jesus identifies the entire Christian community with himself in all that he does. They died with him on the cross, were buried with him, rose with him, ascended with him, are enthroned with him and have their life ever hidden in him. Paul sets this forth most completely in one of those involved images of which he is so fond:

"And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error; but speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love" (Eph. iv. 11–16).

As I have said elsewhere:

"The one body is ever growing up unto the Messiah, the head. Its parts are fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth. This thought of a perfect head and a body in course of construction is complex and difficult to understand. It is probable that the apostle is thinking of the growth of the body from early childhood to full manhood. That is certainly his conception when he alludes to the diversity of workers. They are at first babes liable to be misled; they are to grow into men, and ultimately into full-grown men, into the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Messiah. Every member of the body is a miniature of the whole body, as the Messiah himself is the model of the whole body and of each member of it. It is probable, therefore, that, as the individual Christian is conceived as growing from infancy into manhood, so the whole body of Christians

passes through the same experience, and does not reach its manhood until one and all have attained the perfection of the Messiah. Accordingly we have an involved figure of speech which corresponds with that of the living and growing stones of the temple. The Messiah is the temple of God, every Christian is a temple, and the whole Church is the temple. So the Messiah is the perfect man, every Christian is to become a perfect man, and the whole Church is to become the perfect man. The organic and vital union of the Messiah with his people involves this threefold relation." *The Messiah of the Apostles*, 1895, pp. 202, 204, 205.

We have now gone over ten terms which may be regarded as synonymous terms for representing the New Testament doctrine of the Church. Theologians have usually taken one or more of them and endeavoured to construct a doctrine. Any such effort, whether you use *ἐκκλησία*, or *βασιλεία*, or *συναγωγή*, or "city of God," or "brotherhood," or "temple," or any other, will always be partial and one-sided, and will tend, if unduly unfolded in logical analysis and practical application, to result in errors of various kinds. He who would know the mind of the ever-living, glorified Redeemer, our Lord and our King, our Priest and our Head, should use all these terms, and endeavour to construct them into a harmonious and symmetrical whole. There is in such a method much fruit for the future use of Christ's Church. Holy Scripture contains very much teaching on this, as on other subjects, that has either not been used at all, or else imperfectly and disproportionately used. A blessing is in store for all who will follow the teachings of the Holy Spirit with a mind broad enough to comprehend them and a spirit earnest enough to strive to do all that the Lord and his apostles teach

III

CATHOLIC—THE NAME AND THE THING

THERE is probably no word that is more misused in modern times than "Catholic." It is a name used to conjure with, and it stands for things which excite the passions of men to an extraordinary degree. It is, indeed, one of the great words of Christianity, ripe with historic meaning, and pregnant with all-important consequences. It is important, therefore, that we should know what the name really means, and what things are actually embraced under it. There is only one pathway to this knowledge. We must, so far as practicable, divest ourselves of every form of provincial, sectarian and partisan prejudice, and trace the word in the lines of historic investigation from its origin until it gained a stereotyped meaning.

I. THE TERM CATHOLIC

The word "Catholic" had its origin in the Greek language; and the things it stands for in Christianity originated at a time when the Greek language was the religious language of Christians in the West as well as in the East, in Rome and Africa and Gaul as well as in Alexandria, Asia and Antioch. *καθολικος* is not found in the Greek Bible of the Old Testament, or the New Testament. It is an adjective compounded of the preposition *κατά*, meaning in this connection "throughout," and the adjective *ὅλος*, "whole," properly in the accusative, *ὅλον* or *ὅλην*, in accordance with the noun to which it is attached. These words are used separately often enough in the Greek Bible and in Greek literature. As compounded into an adjective, though quite frequent in

Greek literature in the sense of "universal," it is not found until the sub-apostolic age in Christian literature.

We first meet the word in the epistle of Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, to the church at Smyrna, early in the second century, in the sentence: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the Catholic Church" (8). The Catholic Church is the Church gathered about Jesus as its head, just as the church of Smyrna was gathered about its bishop. The Catholic Church is thus the universal Church as distinguished from the local church, the Church throughout the whole world, under Jesus Christ the bishop of all; as Ignatius says, in this same epistle: "that he might set up an ensign unto all ages, through his resurrection for his saints and faithful people, whether among Jews or among gentiles, in one body of his Church" (1); using *σῶμα*, the favourite term of Paul.

We find three uses of the word in the letter of the church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp, its bishop, soon after the martyrdom in 155 or 156. There is no good reason to question their genuineness. The letter is addressed "to all the sojourning churches of the Holy Catholic Church throughout every place" (1). The martyr, when arrested, offers prayer for "the whole Catholic Church throughout the habitable world" (8). Jesus Christ is represented as "the Shepherd of the Catholic Church throughout the habitable world" (19). It is evident, therefore, that in the church of Smyrna under its bishop Polycarp, and the church of Antioch under its bishop Ignatius, the term "Catholic Church" had become a name for the universal Christian Church as united to Christ the universal Shepherd, Bishop and Lord. The name "catholic," like the names "church" and "apostle" and "Christian," seems to have originated in Antioch.

Although the term does not appear in Hermas, the Roman prophet of this period, yet the conception does. For he uses the image of a tower for the Church as built up of living stones in four courses or generations, of apostles and prophets

and ministers,[1] just as Paul uses the image of a temple;[2] and he conceives of the Church as the bride of Christ,[3] just as Paul does.[4] Hermas frequently uses the term "*holy* Church" for the whole body of Christians united to Christ, in this following Peter, who represents the Christian body as "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."[5] Justin, who represents, in his origin Palestine, and in his chief Christian service Rome, does not use the term "catholic," but writes of the unity of Christians as the true Israel of God in accordance with Paul,[6] and in fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. The *Muratorian Fragment*, representing the Roman church of the latter half of the second century, uses the term "catholic Church" twice, as synonymous with "one Church spread abroad throughout the whole world." Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, who represents Asia in origin, but Gaul in his ministry, writing in the last quarter of the second century, says that "the Catholic Church possesses one and the same faith throughout the whole world."[7] We may say, therefore, that the word "catholic" had become a common name for the Church throughout the world by the close of the second century.

The Christian Church of the second century was not only in conflict with Judaism and heathenism, and so passed through a number of persecutions with its martyrdoms; it also had to wage a still more difficult war against Gnosticism in its manifold forms. It therefore became necessary to battle for genuine Christianity, against the many spurious forms proposed by the Gnostics to make an eclectic religion by mingling Christianity and heathenism; and Christian writers were obliged to appeal for authority to the traditions of the apostolic sees and to the apostolic writings. The Catholic Church, therefore, insisted upon its historic unity with the apostles, as well as upon its geographical unity

[1] Sim. ix. 15. [2] Eph. ii. 19–22. [3] Vis. iv. 2.
[4] Eph. v. 23–27. [5] I Peter ii. 5. [6] Gal. vi. 16.
[7] *Adv. Haer.*, I, x. 3.

throughout the world, and its mystic or vital unity with the enthroned and reigning Christ. Irenæus is the most reliable exponent of this situation. He speaks of the "rule of the truth which he received by means of baptism."[1] "The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith," which he defines in terms similar to the Apostles' Creed.[2]

> The Church, having received this preaching and this faith, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet as if occupying but one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these points just as if she had but one soul, and one and the same heart; and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down with perfect harmony, as if she possessed only one mouth, For although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. (*Ibid.*, x:2.) . . . . "When we refer the heretics to that tradition which originates from the apostles, which is preserved by means of the succession of presbyters in the churches," they object to the tradition, saying that "they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth." (*Ibid.*, III. ii : 2.)

And so the three great adjectives qualifying the Church gradually originated, "*holy*," "*catholic*," and "*apostolic*." Writers differ in their use of these terms. They were often used interchangeably as standing for essentially the same things. The adjective used in connection with the article of the Church, in the so-called Apostles' Creed, varies in the ancient writers. The original form of the Roman symbol was probably "Holy Church," the word of St. Peter and Hermas, which was subsequently enlarged to "Holy Catholic Church" not later than the early years of the fourth century.

The name "catholic" thus stood for three essential things: (1) the vital unity of the Church in Christ; (2) the geographical unity of the Church extending throughout the world; (3) the historical unity of the Church in apostolic tradition. These things only gradually emerged from concrete forms

[1] *Ibid.*, I, ix. 4; *cf.* xxii. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, x. 1.

of common experience into abstract forms of definition, due partly to the external forces of controversy, partly to internal forces of evolution.

II. CATHOLICITY AND APOSTOLICITY

It is undoubtedly true, as Irenæus and other ancient Fathers have stated, that there was in Christianity a sacred deposit, committed in oral instruction by the apostles to the churches which they established, and which did not find complete expression in apostolic writings. Moreover, the Church was inhabited by the divine Spirit, the great teacher, counsellor and guide, in accordance with the promises of Jesus and the experience as well as the teachings of the apostles. This deposit was used by the Church under the guidance of the divine Spirit, when it was needed in the unfolding of its knowledge and of its life. It soon became necessary, after the death of the apostles and of their immediate successors, to collect in definite forms some of the essential things of this deposit. We cannot take time to trace the gradual evolution of these things in the different apostolic sees; but it was certainly the work of the second Christian century to give us the consensus of the Church, in a Canon of Holy Scripture, a Creed known as the Apostles' Creed, and the organisation of the Church in its order, discipline and worship.

Several important questions now emerge:

1. If the Catholic Church maintains its unity with the apostles by historic succession, ought we not to limit the scope of Catholicity to those things that can be proved, from apostolic writings, to be the teaching of the apostles? In this case the New Testament would be the test of Catholicity, and not the writings of the Fathers of the second Christian century. If the teaching of the apostles is to be limited to that recorded in the writing of the New Testament, then we must either limit ourselves to the express teaching of the New Testament, or recognise at the same time legitimate

logical deductions and practical applications. This latter principle has been so universally recognised that it is hardly worth our while to argue for it. If this be so, then the Church of the second century in its logical unfolding and practical application of the teaching of the New Testament gave the Church what may be called the Catholic type, as distinguished from the New Testament type.

But we must go farther than this, and say that it is difficult to suppose that the entire teaching of the apostles is actually recorded in the New Testament. The teaching of one apostle, St. Paul, dominates the New Testament. Where shall we find the teaching of the Twelve, commissioned by our Lord to make disciples of all nations and teach them his commands, unless we find it in the traditions of the churches which they established? It is recognised by many modern historians that the Christian Church of the second century did not follow Paul in his distinctive teachings; but was more in accord with such teachings of Jesus as we find in the synoptic Gospels, and with what we know of the mind of the Twelve only by incidental references in the New Testament. Arguing back from effect to cause, there must have been other extended and more powerful influences than those of St. Paul, leading even the Roman Church in somewhat different lines from those St. Paul marked out. How can this be explained unless we suppose that St. Peter and other authoritative teachers gave instruction which did not find its way into writings, but was written in the minds of their hearers and inscribed upon the institutions of the Church?

When Harnack says that "only one Gentile Christian, Marcion, understood Paul" (in the second century), "and he misunderstood him";[1] what is that but to imply that St. Paul's theology as understood by Harnack had not the same preponderating influence in the Church that it has in the New Testament? But inasmuch as the Epistles of Paul were gathered into the Canon before the catholic Epistles, and especially in the Roman Church, may it not also imply

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I (1886). p. 62.

that the Church of the second century did not understand those Epistles as some moderns do; and may they not after all have been correct?

The old Protestant view that the Church of the second century declined from the apostolic faith, as expressed in the New Testament, is historically impossible and incredible. Such an unfaithful and declining Church could never have sustained the stress of martyrdom and have overcome the seductions of Gnosticism, and then have come out of the martyrdoms of the second and third centuries into the victories of the fourth century. It is not valid historical criticism which justifies the interpretation of the evolution of Catholic Christianity as a secularisation of Christianity. It is not true that Greek philosophy and Roman administration secularised Christianity.

Clement of Alexandria was more just in his estimation of the facts when he said:

> Perchance, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily till the Lord should call the Greeks. For this was a schoolmaster to bring the Hellenic mind, as the Law the Hebrew, to Christ. Philosophy, therefore, was a preparation paving the way for him who is perfected in Christ. *Strom.* 1, 5.

The same may be said of the Roman administration. Philosophy was prepared by divine Providence to give Christianity its philosophic form for doctrine, and the Roman administration was prepared in the same way to give Christianity its administrative organisation. To regard all this as secularisation, and as a victory of vanquished heathenism over Christianity, is to misinterpret Christian history. It is an effort to interpret ancient Christianity after a modern theory which is contrary to the principles of the philosophy of history and any just conception of historical evolution. It is not strange that this theory results in making the history of dogma end in bankruptcy.

It is necessary to say that New Testament Christianity is one thing, Catholic Christianity is another, later, and in

some respects more complete thing, however far short it may fall of the ideals of Christ and his apostles in other respects.

The next question that emerges is whether we are to limit Catholic Christianity to the consensus of Christianity as recorded in the writings of the second Christian century. We have already seen that we cannot limit the teaching of the apostles to that teaching as recorded in the New Testament. So we cannot limit the teaching of the Catholic Church to that which has been transmitted to us in those writings of the second century which have been preserved; for as many of the prophets and apostles of the first century were not so much writers as teachers, preachers, and organisers of churches; just so in the second century many of the great bishops and teachers have left us no literary monuments, and many of the writings of other influential teachers and writers have been lost. We have, therefore, only a very partial and incomplete literary expression of the faith and life of the Church when it realised, emphasised, and gave expression in historic forms to its Catholicity. The Church of the third and fourth centuries cannot be explained merely on the basis of the literature of the second century. Furthermore, the divine Spirit was working mightily in the Church and guiding the Church in all its parts to use its sacred deposit by logical deduction and practical application to new needs and circumstances as they arose. Especially in the field of the practical application of Christianity, literary records often fail us when most needed. It is necessary to supplement to some extent, therefore, the literature of this century, if we would comprehend all that the Catholic Church stood for at the close of that century. But how far shall we go in this regard and where shall we stop?

It is necessary to include the third Christian century with the second in thinking of the ancient Catholic Church, for there is no evident line of cleavage between them. The processes of the second century did not reach their conclusion until the third century. The external struggles of Christian

Rome with imperial Rome still continued, and the blood of the martyrs continued to attest the reality of the Catholic faith and life. The integrity of Apostolic Christianity had still to be maintained against various eccentricities and corruptions. The internal evolution of the Church under the guidance of the divine Spirit went on, and treasures new as well as old were brought forth from its sacred deposits. The Canon had been defined as to its first and second layers; but there was still uncertainty as to the Apocrypha, the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation, and other early Christian writings. There was a consensus in the Apostles' Creed as to the essentials of its primitive Roman form, but its clauses had not altogether reached their final form. But especially in the life and institutions of the Church the writers of the third century give us important help to determine even the consensus of the second century. There can be no doubt that the Church has always been influenced by external more than by internal forces in the formulas it has constructed at successive stages in its history. It is, therefore, those features of Christianity that are more external which are most emphasised before the world. Those features which are more internal and esoteric are in the background of documents and writings, and in not a few instances are outside the scope of their discussion. In this case the silence of documents may be the best evidence of Catholic consensus on such matters as were already established beyond controversy. It is necessary, therefore, if we would understand Catholicity in its entire scope, to ascertain the consensus of the Christianity of the second and third centuries as to Christian life and Christian institutions as well as to Christian doctrine. It is especially necessary to do this because with the fourth century the great doctrinal discussions came into the field which were determined by the great ecumenical councils, fixing the orthodoxy of the Church, and as a result of this situation the faith of the Church became the most prominent thing; and that cast its shadow over the previous centuries also, giving an exaggerated im-

portance to the preparatory evolution of doctrine in those centuries in the statements of subsequent writers.

III. CATHOLICITY AND ORTHODOXY

Standing on the basis of the ancient Ecumenical Councils, the Greek Church has ever named itself the Orthodox Church. The question now arises: Are we entitled to use these definitions of orthodoxy as belonging to Catholic Christianity? May we say that these are simply definitions of that which the Church really believed in the previous centuries, and that they are only a necessary evolution of the sacred deposit of apostolic and Catholic teaching? A careful study of the question makes it evident that, as we distinguish Catholic Christianity as a second stage to New Testament Christianity, so we must distinguish Orthodox Christianity as a third stage in the order of evolution of Christianity. We have no more right to put the definitions of the great Ecumenical Councils back into the Catholic Church of the previous centuries, than we have to put the definitions of the Catholic Church of the second and third centuries back into the New Testament times.

It may, however, be urged that, while this may be true of all the later councils, it cannot be true of the Council of Nicæa; for we must regard that council as giving expression, at the beginning of the fourth century, to the consensus of the Church of the previous century. But we cannot take that position in fact, for the Nicene Council did not define the consensus of Christianity. It made one opinion orthodox and dominant over against a widely prevailing Arianism and Semi-Arianism. If, moreover, we recognise that the first council may define the Catholic Faith by limiting orthodoxy to one of several views hitherto prevailing, and may so divide the Catholic Church into sections, of which only one can be called Catholic, there is no valid reason why we should stop with that council, or indeed with any council, for it establishes the principle that to be and remain Catholic,

one must accept as final the decisions of the Catholic Church on any question, in any and every age until the end of the world. And this is quite easy so soon as the principle is recognised. For we have to bear in mind that the Roman Catholic Church has always claimed in such decisions that it is not really making any new doctrines, but simply defining apostolic Christian doctrine over against errors which have sprung up in contravention to it. If these later definitions of catholic doctrine are to be regarded as really catholic, then as an inevitable consequence catholic and orthodox—Catholic and Roman—become practically convertible terms.

Moreover, we cannot limit Catholicity to dogma, as many vainly suppose. We cannot think ourselves catholic simply because we agree with the Greeks in holding to the definitions of the great Ecumenical Councils. Catholic, as we have seen, covers not only the Faith of the Church, but also, indeed primarily, its institutions and its life. If, indeed, we recognise that there has been a sacred deposit transmitted by tradition in the Church other than Holy Scripture, it is necessary from the very nature of the case to find that deposit more largely in religious institutions and ethical life than in doctrine. If Catholicity is to be extended to the evolution of doctrine, it must also be extended to the evolution of institution, and thus the whole system of mediæval rites and ceremonies, the scholastic sacramental system, and papal organisation, come inevitably into the range of Catholicity as necessary to constitute a truly Catholic Church.

We see all about us men on various steps leading to this goal. Those who insist upon the Nicene Creed as the test may be conceived as on the first step, although many of these are inconsistent enough in that they are not willing to rise to the position of the men of Nicæa as to sacrament and ecclesiastical organisation. Many wish to go so far as to comprehend the dogmatic decisions of all the Ecumenical Councils, although they shrink from the religious life and institutions that developed in parallel lines with these dog-

mas. Still others there are, who under the name of Catholic would introduce Augustinianism in whole or in part. Still others would insist upon all the chief dogmas and institutions characteristic of the Western Church before the Reformation, and undo all the work of reform except the single item of separation from the jurisdiction of Rome. But it is difficult to see why any one who has gone so far should not take the final step. For it were mere wantonness to separate from the jurisdiction of Rome and break the geographical unity of the Church for no other motive than ecclesiastical independence. The Reformers were compelled to this separation by great differences of dogma and institution, where, they at least thought, they followed the authority of Holy Scripture and conscience in its convictions, at great cost to themselves. It is mere perversity not to return to Rome if the conscience is convinced that Rome is right in all her great controversies with Protestantism.

It is evident from what has been said that there is not only a confusion in men's minds, through the different interpretations that they give to the name "catholic" and the things they comprehend under it; but there is, indeed, real difficulty in fixing the limits of Catholicity by Historical Criticism. The dust of centuries, the cinders of a multitude of controversies, cover it over. It is not such an easy problem as many imagine.

IV. CATHOLIC AND ROMAN

At this point it is necessary to consider the question discussed so thoroughly by Harnack as to the relation of the terms "Catholic" and "Roman." There can be no doubt that at the close of the third Christian century "Roman" and "Catholic" were so closely allied that they were practically identical. What was it historically that attached the terms "Roman" and "Catholic" so closely together in the second and third centuries? Harnack has given a very able and thorough study of this question, which in all essential par-

ticulars must be recognised as historically correct. As he states, all the distinctive elements of Catholicity found their first expression in the Roman church.[1]

1. The Apostles' Creed is essentially a Roman symbol.

2. It was in Rome that the Canon of Holy Scripture first began to be fixed; and the Roman Canon gradually became the norm for the entire Church.

3. The list of bishops with the doctrine of apostolic succession appears historically first in the Roman church.

4. The Roman constitution became the norm even for Oriental Churches.

5. There can be no doubt that to the Roman church of the second century was assigned in some sense the primacy in the Christian Church. This was due to the fact that it was in the capital of the Roman Empire, that Christians from all parts of the world resorted thither; and it became in this way cosmopolitan, the most truly representative of all churches, the whole Church, as it were, in miniature.

Rome was the centre of the struggle of Christianity against imperial Rome, the chief seat of martyrdom. It had the unique advantage of the two chief apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, if not as its founders, at least as its chief teachers, sealing their testimony with their blood. It was also in Rome that the chief victories were won over Gnosticism, over Marcion, and later over the Montanists and the Donatists. To Rome all parties appealed for her opinion in matters of controversy. Rome thus became the citadel of genuine Christianity. It was at Rome that the Christian institutions received their richest and strongest development, and the Christian life had the largest scope for its activity in all the various manifestations of holy love, and the severest tests of its reality and power. This primacy, we may say, was universally acknowledged; although especially in the third century when the Roman bishops strained their primacy so as to dictate to other sees, their dictation was on several occasions resented and resisted. Before the close of the

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, Bd. I, pp. 362–71.

first century, Clement writes in the name of the Roman church a letter to the church of Corinth and sends representatives to heal its divisions, just as St. Paul had sent Titus on an earlier occasion. Ignatius in his epistle to Rome recognised the Roman church as προκαθημένη, having the presidency, especially in love. The aged Polycarp does not shrink from a long journey to Rome in order to perfect communion with its bishop. As Harnack says, Anicetus did not go to Polycarp, but Polycarp to him. Irenæus says:

> Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorised meetings; (we do this, I say), by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolical tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere. (*Adv. Haer.*, III, iii. 2.)

To go farther would be to needlessly heap up witnesses. As Harnack says:

> The proposition, "*ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum,*" and the other, that catholic virtually means Roman Catholic, are gross fictions when devised in honour of the temporary occupant of the Roman see, and detached from the significance of the Eternal City in secular history; but applied to the church of the imperial capital they contain a truth, the denial of which is equivalent to renouncing the attempt to explain the process by which the church was unified and catholicised. (Vol. I, p. 371.)

There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholic Church of our day is the heir by unbroken descent to the Roman Catholic Church of the second century, and that it is justified in using the name "catholic" as the name of the Church,

as well as the name "Roman." But this does not by any means imply that all that is Roman, or has been Roman since the third century, may be included under the term "catholic." Nor does it determine whether other Christian Churches may in our day rightly claim to be catholic. That depends upon the decision we may give to other questions we must now consider.

We must now return to the Chureh of the second and third centuries—the ante-Nicene Church. There can be no doubt that the Church at that time was catholic and that it was possessed of all the elements of catholicity. As we have seen, these were: (1) A consciousness of geographical unity in one Church spread throughout the world; (2) A historical unity by succession with the apostles. This involves that nothing shall be regarded as catholic that cannot be derived as a normal development of the Apostolic Church. (3) A vital or mystic unity with Christ was also essential. This involves that Christian life and worship, as instituted by the historic Christ and maintained by union with the reigning Christ, shall be conserved as making the Church truly holy.

We have seen that Catholic Christianity expressed its unity in the Canon of Holy Scripture and in the old Roman Creed, both of which were regarded as apostolic. If holding these be the test of Catholicity, all organised Christian churches are catholic—Lutheran and Reformed, Congregational, Methodist and Baptist—as well as Anglican, Greek, Oriental and Roman. But it is evident that these documents give only a partial expression of Catholic Christianity. The writers of the second Christian century exhibited a consensus with the Apostolic Church (and also with the Church throughout the world) in other things no less essential than Holy Scripture and Creed.

The most essential thing in Catholic Unity is unity in Christ. This, in the consensus of the ante-Nicene Church, consists in two things—the ethical unity of love and the religious unity in the holy eucharist. Both of these appear

in the letter of Pliny to Trajan at the opening of the first Christian century. Both appear in the *Teaching of the Apostles* at about the same time. Christian love, in its Christ-like form of self-sacrificing love to the brethren, enemies and persecutors, is the first thing in the Way of Life, one of the two ways which begin this document. In the second part, the holy eucharist, is the pure sacrifice, the spiritual food and drink of the Church to be partaken of only by those baptised into the name of the Lord.

V. THE ETHICAL PRINCIPLE OF CATHOLICITY

Let us look a little more closely at the catholic *ethical principle.* There is nothing in which Catholic consensus is so distinct as in this. Justin and the other apologists make it the characteristic thing in the Christian life. Hermas brings out distinctly Christian love as a counsel of perfection. He puts it in the form of a parable where the servant not only keeps all the commands of his master, but does a good work besides for the vineyard. This is then interpreted as follows:

> Keep the commandments of the Lord, and thou shalt be well-pleasing to God, and shalt be enrolled among the number of them that keep his commandments. But if thou do any good thing outside the commandments of God, thou shalt win for thyself more exceeding glory and shalt be more glorious in the sight of God than thou wouldst otherwise have been. (*Sim.* 5:3.)

Ignatius, in his epistle to the Ephesians, says that:

> Love is the way that leadeth up to God (9). Let us be zealous to be imitators of the Lord, vying with each other who shall suffer the greater wrong, who shall be defrauded, who shall be set at naught. (10).

Irenæus, after referring to the tradition of doctrine and ancient constitution of the Church and the succession of the bishops, mentions in his climax "the pre-eminent gift of love, which is more precious than knowledge, more glorious

than prophecy, and which excels all other gifts,"[1] with an evident use of I Cor. xiii; and he makes this love characteristic of the Catholic Church as distinguished from all heretics.[2]

Indeed, this ethical principle of holy love alone enables us to explain the organic unity of the Catholic Church and the primacy of Rome. Ignatius sees in the Roman Church "the presidency of love." Clement, writing as the head of the Roman Church to Corinth, uses no other authority than that of love:

> Let him that hath love in Christ fulfil the commandments of Christ. Who can declare the bond of the love of God? Who is sufficient to tell the majesty of its beauty? The height, whereunto love exalteth, is unspeakable. Love joineth us unto God; love covereth a multitude of sins; love endureth all things, is long-suffering in all things. There is nothing coarse, nothing arrogant in love. Love hath no divisions, love maketh no seditions, love doeth all things in concord. In love were all the elect of God made perfect; without love nothing is well-pleasing to God; in love the Master took us unto himself; for the love which he had toward us, Jesus Christ our Lord hath given his blood for us by the will of God, and his flesh for our flesh and his life for our lives. Ye see, dearly beloved, how great and marvellous a thing is love, and there is no declaring its perfection. Who is sufficient to be found therein save those to whom God shall vouchsafe it? Let us therefore entreat and ask of His mercy that we may be found blameless in love, standing apart from the factiousness of men (49, 50).

Dionysius of Corinth at a later date, writing to Soter, the bishop of Rome, says:

> From the beginning it has been your practice to do good to all the brethren in various ways, and to send contributions to many churches in every city. Thus relieving the want of the needy and making provision for the brethren in the mines, by the gifts which you have sent from the beginning. You Romans keep up the hereditary customs of the Romans, which your blessed bishop Soter has not only maintained, but also added to, furnishing an abundance of supplies to the saints and encouraging the brethren from abroad with blessed words as a loving father his children. Eusebius, *Church History*, IV, 23:10.

[1] iv. 8. [2] iv. 7, 9.

Hippolytus, schismatic bishop of Rome and martyr, compares the Church to a ship tossed in the great deep of the world, whose skilled pilot is Christ, and the ropes that bind her together are the love of Christ.[1] The unity of the Church is in holy love which binds Christians to Christ and to one another. The primacy of Rome was recognised because she was the champion of Christianity in holy love. The church of Smyrna says:

> The martyrs, as disciples and imitators of the Lord, we cherish as they deserve for their matchless affection toward their own king and teacher. May it be our lot also to be found partakers and fellow-disciples with them. (17).

Rome was the martyr Church above all others. In her the two chief apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, suffered. In her, a great multitude from all lands perished in the dreadful blood-bath of Nero, which is the undertone of the book of Revelation. In her, Ignatius of Antioch, Clement, Hippolytus, Justin and a host of Christian heroes suffered and died for the faith. In her, St. Cecilia, St. Agnes and a multitude of matrons and virgins offered up themselves in loving sacrifice to Christ. The Roman Church has its foundations in martyrs' blood, and this more than anything else makes her pre-eminent and perpetuates her pre-eminence. In Rome one feels close to the martyrs, in touch with original Christianity. If only the Roman Church had maintained her pre-eminence in love, no one would ever have denied her primacy. If she had been content to follow the Master as the servant of all the Churches, she would have easily ruled them all. But when she began to substitute legal constitutions and physical force for the moral influence of love, she erred from the fundamental catholic principle. But what other Church can cast the stone at her for this fault? It is a common fault of them all. If only Rome would renew her first love, the reunion of the Catholic Church would be assured.

[1] *Christ and Antichrist*, 59.

VI. THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE OF CATHOLICITY

The holy eucharist was the *religious principle* of union with Christ. There can be no doubt that the consensus of the ante-Nicene Church was that it was an eating of the flesh of Christ and the drinking of his blood as a sacrifice. It is most common to regard it, as in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, as a fulfilment of the prediction of the pure sacrifice of the prophet Malachi.[1] Thus Ignatius early in the century says:

I desire the bread of God which is the flesh of Christ, who was of the seed of David, and for a draught I desire his blood, which is love incorruptible. (*Romans*, 7.) . . . Be ye careful to observe one eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup into union with his blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-servants. (Phil. 4.)

Justin says:

For not as common bread or as common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of his word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. (*Apol.*, I, 66.). . . . So he then (that is, Malachi) speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifice to him; *i. e.*, the bread of the eucharist and also the cup of the eucharist. (*Trypho.*, 41.)

Irenæus says:

He [that is, Jesus] has acknowledged the cup (which is a part of the creation) as his own blood, from which he bedews our blood; and the bread (also a part of the creation) he has established as his own body from which he gives increase to our bodies. (*Adv. Haer.*, V, 2:2.)

The consensus of the ante-Nicene Church is that the eucharist is a thank-offering, after the teaching of Paul. But about this consensus gathered in the course of time a cloud of theories which has obscured the original meaning of this

[1] Mal. i. 11.

essential institution of the Christian religion. Having lost sight of the ancient distinction between different kinds of sacrifices, when the Augustinian doctrine of sin became dominant in the Church, the conception of the sacrifice as a sin-offering to a great extent took the place of the primitive conception that it was a eucharistic or thank-offering.

The participation in the holy communion as a sacrificial feast was the consensus of the ante-Nicene Church. This has also been overlaid with theories as to the mode of the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ, which do not belong to the Catholic Faith. It is one of the most important movements of our times that there has been a return to the original Catholic conception, not only in the Anglican Church, but in the Roman Church, and in many Protestant theologians. Here again is a thread which may soon become a rope to bind the Church in Catholic Unity.

I have taken considerable time to unfold these more vital principles of catholic unity, because these are usually ignored in the discussions of the subject, in the interest of the more external marks of dogma and ecclesiastical organisation. In fact, the development of the historical episcopate was due to the needs of a proper celebration of the holy eucharist, as may be seen in the epistles of Ignatius, as well as to the needs of ecclesiastical government and discipline. In the ancient Catholic Church, as in the Church of all ages, vital principles determine the formal principles, although later the vital principles are too often cramped by the forms of their own creation.

Although the Church of Rome in its dogmatic teaching has overlaid the Catholic conception of the holy eucharist with the dogma of transubstantiation, and pressed the eucharist behind the sin-offering, yet that cannot be said of the ceremony of the mass, which is free in its language and ceremonies from both of these conceptions. No one can deny that the Roman Church, the Greek Church and all the Oriental Churches are catholic in this particular. But what of the Protestant bodies? Is the Church of England catholic in

this respect? Do its standards represent the catholic experience in the celebration of the holy eucharist? The "Articles of Religion" cannot be so explained; "The Book of Common Prayer" may be; but it is at least doubtful whether that was the intention of its original authors. It was, however, the intent of the Elizabethan Reformers to make it possible for Catholic and Protestant to use the "Common Prayer" alike. This may be shown from the history of the times. The best that can be said of other Protestant churches is that they are not anti-Catholic in this particular, and that there is a tendency among them to return to the primitive Catholic conception.

VII. GEOGRAPHICAL UNITY AND CATHOLICITY

We shall now resume the more formal tests and apply them also. Geographical unity has been lost by the Protestant churches—by the Church of England more than by any other; for the Church of England is so strictly a National Church that she is confined to the Anglo-Saxon race. She not only has no communion with the Roman Catholic Church, but she also has no communion at present with the sister National Churches. In this respect she is farther off from catholicity than the Lutheran Church, which is represented in many lands, and which even in the United States is a stronger body numerically than the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Church of England is still farther off from Catholicity than the Reformed or Presbyterian family of Churches, which is the most widespread and most numerous of all Protestant bodies, and which has always recognised the Anglican and Lutheran bodies as her sisters, and has always been ready to commune with them. The Reformed or Presbyterian Churches have always made more of Catholicity in its geographical form than the Church of England. One looks in vain in the "Articles of Religion" for any conception of a Catholic Church. But in the Westminster Confession it is very prominent.

I. The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. II. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the Law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. (Chap. xxv.)

The Westminster divines conceived of an Ecumenical Council of Reformed Churches. Their chief purpose was to reform the Church of England in accordance with the teachings of Holy Scripture and the example of the best Reformed Churches of the continent, in order to closer union and fellowship with them. But the Church of England held aloof, content to be simply a national Church. The Church of England asserts her catholicity in apostolical succession through the threefold ministry. For this she has struggled as if she realised that her very existence depended upon it. But is she in this respect so very much superior to other sister Churches of the Reformation? It may be doubted. For many of them likewise claim apostolical succession for their ministry—they also have the three orders—bishops, elders and deacons; only their orders are orders of the congregation and not of the diocese; and they claim that, though this succession for many centuries ran through a line of presbyters and not diocesan bishops, these presbyters were the only Catholic bishops, the bishops of the first and second centuries being parochial and not diocesan. So far as a reconciliation with Rome is concerned, since the decision of Leo XIII. the Church of England has no advantage whatever over the Reformed Churches in this matter of apostolic succession. Any advantage she may have is limited to her own estimation of herself. Newman tells us how he was caught in the Anglican *Via Media:*

The Anglican disputant took his stand upon antiquity of apostolicity, the Roman upon catholicity. The Anglican said to the Roman: "There

is but one faith, the ancient, and you have not kept it." The Roman retorted: "There is but one Church, the Catholic, and you are out of it." The Anglican urged: "Your special beliefs, practices, modes of action are nowhere in antiquity." The Roman objected: "You do not communicate with any one Church besides your own and its offshoots, and you have discarded principles, doctrines, sacraments, and usages, which are and ever have been received in the East and the West." . . . The true Church as defined in the creeds was both catholic and apostolic; now, as I viewed the controversy in which I was engaged, England and Rome had divided these notes or prerogatives between them; the cause lay thus, Apostolicity *versus* Catholicity. (*Apologia*, chap. iii. new edition, 1892, p. 106.)

He tells us how it was the words of St. Augustine—*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*—quoted by Wiseman in an article in the *Dublin Review*, August, 1839, that opened his eyes to see that

the deliberate judgment in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede (p. 117).

Wiseman in that article said:

St. Augustine has a golden sentence on that subject, which should be an axiom in theology.[1] "Therefore the entire world judges with security that they are not good who separate themselves from the entire world, in whatever part of the world" (p. 154).

This sentence made Newman a Roman Catholic. He saw clearly, what multitudes have seen since, that you cannot build catholicity on apostolicity alone; and that, where these are brought into conflict, catholicity in the narrower sense of universality is sure to win.

It has been too often overlooked by Anglicans that "catholic" comprehends much more than apostolicity. It also includes holiness or purity. It was the exaggeration of that attribute that induced the ancient Donatists to separate from the Church, and that influenced also the English Separatists, too often confounded with Puritans and Presbyterians. It

[1] He quotes it in Latin from *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, III, 4, and translates it.

was the emphasis upon pure doctrine, pure discipline and pure life, as more important than unity, that really influenced to a great extent the whole Protestant movement, and specially those bodies which have separated from the Protestant national Churches.

As we have seen, the attributes *holy*, *apostolic* and *catholic* are so involved that they ought not to be separated—the three blend in true catholic unity, the three are all involved in the saying of Vincent of Lirens: "*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*" This is often misunderstood by taking it out of its context. Vincent himself defines *ubique* as universality, *semper* as antiquity and *ab omnibus* as consensus—and the consensus not as the consensus of all Christians, but as sacerdotal and magisterial consensus in the Church.[1]

The three are indeed combined in this sentence:

> He must collate and consult and interrogate the opinions of the ancients, of those, namely, who, though living in divers times and places, yet continuing in the communion and faith of the one catholic Church, stand forth acknowledged and approved authorities. *Ibid*, 3.

Each one of these terms qualifies the other, and no one can be regarded as sufficient apart by itself. Doubtless the Church should be *holy* as united to Christ in all its parts, that is the most essential thing; it should also be *apostolic*, that is next in importance; but it must also be *catholic* in the narrower sense of universality; in order to be catholic in the larger sense of *Catholic Unity*, blending the three attributes.

VIII. THE CATHOLIC REACTION

It depends altogether on what tests you apply, whether an individual or a Church can be considered catholic or not. If we would be catholic, we cannot become catholic by merely calling ourselves by that name. Unless the name corresponds

[1] *Commonitorium*, 2.

with the thing, it is a sham, and it is a shame. Many earnest Christians, not only Anglicans, but men of every name and denomination of Christians, are under the influence of a catholic reaction and are sincerely desirous of being truly catholic, and especially of regaining the Catholic Unity of the Church. When we have regained the thing, then we may with propriety call ourselves by the name.

A great step forward in the catholic direction was taken when the Quadrilateral of Unity was adopted jointly by the Protestant Episcopal Church of America and the Church of England. It is not a perfect statement. It is easy to criticise it. It does not in all respects correspond with Catholicity. It exceeds it in some respects, it falls short in others. But it is the best platform of Catholic Unity which has thus far been proposed. The truest Catholicity is brotherly love, and if the Quadrilateral could be used with this vital force beneath it, it would accomplish a great work in the reconciliation, recatholicisation and the eventual reunification of the Christian Church.

The reason why it has not been more effective is that the bishops have done nothing whatever to make it effective, or even to convince others that they really accepted it themselves. A magnificent opportunity has been thrown away.

Nothing has so much injured the Church of England in the past as its arrogant exclusiveness as a national Church. That has brought her into the present crisis of her history, torn by faction and reproached by a multitude of enemies. Her daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, has too often exhibited this baneful temper and so repelled multitudes who would otherwise have gladly united with her.

If she permit that evil spirit, which is at the root of all the disasters to British Christianity since the Reformation, again to become dominant, she will forfeit her leadership as the banner-bearer of Catholic Unity. If she arrogate to herself the name "Catholic," which is regarded as the common inheritance of Christianity in some sense by all who use the

Apostles' Creed, no one will recognise her right to it but herself; a multitude of her own clergy and people will be ashamed of their Church; and she will become the mock of historical critics, who will not fail to test her by her own history, as well as by the history of the Church at large, and by her relative importance in American Christianity.

The greatest movement now going on in the world is the Catholic reaction; it is too great a movement to be guided or controlled by any leadership. God's Holy Spirit is breaking the way for the revival, the recatholicisation and reunion of Christendom, in holy love.

It must be said, however, that most Protestants do not as yet wish to be Catholic; they desire simply to be Christians; they would have what they regard as the simple Christianity of Christ and his apostles; they would reform the Church after the teachings of the New Testament. A large party would go farther still in an anti-catholic direction, and seek the essence of Christianity underlying the New Testament, and especially the real substance of the teachings of Jesus. It is certainly true that to be Catholic is one thing and to be Christian is another thing; the latter is more important than the former. We should not identify them. In these days men will appropriate just so much of Christianity as they can use, and no more. You cannot constrain them by persecution, whether physical, ecclesiastical or social. You cannot compel them by authority, whether of Church or of Bible. And, after all, what is it that the Lord looks at most of all? It is not what we name ourselves, it is not what we profess, it is not what we teach to others; it is what we are and what we do. Far better a minimum of the sacred deposit of Christianity well used than the maximum "laid up in a napkin."[1] And yet the earnest Christian should not be content with the minimum. Loving, growing Christianity strives for the maximum. Christianity so soon as it began to grow, grew into Catholicity. The Church was Catholic in its early manhood, in its heroic age. A Church

[1] Luke xix. 20.

which is content to be simply Christian remains in its infancy. A Christian who is content with the essence of Christianity remains in his babyhood; as Paul clearly expresses it—"tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error."[1] That is the exact situation, and always has been, and always will be, the situation of those who wish to have only, what they think to be, the essentials of Christianity. But those who would attain Christian manhood, either as churches or as individuals, must rise to true Catholicity, at least in some measure. As Paul continues to say:

> that they, speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love. (Eph. iv. 16, 18).

[1] Eph. iv. 14.

IV

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

THE aspirations for the reunion of Christendom that have been felt by large numbers of Christians in most, if not all, the denominations, have reached the fullest and strongest expression in recent times, in the four articles proposed by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, October 20, 1886, as a basis of approach for such reunion. These were subsequently adopted, with slight modifications, in 1888, by the Lambeth Conference, representing the Church of England and her daughters throughout the world.

In January, 1887, in the *Presbyterian Review*, of which I was then senior editor, I said that these articles "are in my judgment entirely satisfactory, provided nothing more is meant by their authors than their language expressly conveys."

I subsequently reiterated this statement:

> The four terms that are set forth therein as "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom" are in my judgment entirely satisfactory, provided nothing more is meant by their authors than their language expressly conveys. There is room for some difference of interpretation; but these terms ought to be received in the same generous manner in which they are offered, in the hope that the differences will be removed by conference and discussion. (*Whither?* p. 263.)

I have seen no reason to change the judgment then expressed. The evolutions that are now taking place in the different denominations in the revision of Prayer-Book and of Creed, in the reorganization of Christian life and work, and in the adoption of new methods for evangelisation and

Christian nurture, all point in the same direction, and show that the Christian denominations are moving under the sway of an irresistible impulse into closer combinations that will ere long result in federation, and at last in consolidation.

The articles of Reunion are the following:

(1) "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God; (2) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal Symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith; (3) The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord —ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him; (4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

We reserve for the present a discussion of the first three articles, and shall devote our attention here to the fourth; the Historic Episcopate.

The great difficulty to be overcome is the Historic Episcopate. We ought not to be surprised at this, for the struggles of British Christianity since the Reformation have been centred in questions of the government and discipline of the Church. The debates about ecclesiastical government have been complicated with the contests over political government. The historical student traces the development of ecclesiastical government in Great Britain and America in the midst of the evolutions of civil government. Political parties and ecclesiastical parties have to a very great extent coincided in the history of Great Britain.

The Historical Episcopate has been historically complicated with the development of the intricate relations of Church and State. The same difficult relation is now one of the chief influences at work in favour of restoring the Historical Episcopate to those Churches that have neglected it or discarded it.

I. CHURCH AND STATE

Even the greatest champions of the *jure divino* theory of Church government have not escaped the subtile Erastian-

ism which, even when it declines to put the supreme authority over the Church in the hands of the civil magistrate, nevertheless insensibly assimilates the operations of church courts to the civil courts, and the methods of administration of bishops and presbyters to those of magistrates and parliaments. The American Republic, when it severed for the most part the Church from the State, did not altogether avoid the influence of civil government upon ecclesiastical government. It is a pleasing fiction that the divorce of Church and State is complete in the United States. But it becomes evident so soon as strife breaks out in any congregation, or an irreconcilable battle is waged between parties in the denominations, that the civil courts are the courts of last resort even for ecclesiastical affairs. And now that the Church is becoming more ethical and less dogmatic, more practical and less theoretical, it is plain that the Church and the State must come to an understanding upon the mixed questions of Public Education, National Religion, Marriage and Divorce; the care of the sick, the disabled, the poor and the criminal classes; and in the entire field of social and industrial life. This fiction of a divorce of Church and State has been a will-o'-the-wisp that has brought us into many difficult and dangerous places. It is necessary that Church and State should come into closer union, in order to accomplish the great aims of humanity as well as of Christianity. The Church cannot abstain from those ethical questions that are the controlling principles of all sound government. There must be harmony between Church and State, or else there will be conflict. The worst position that can be taken by the Church is indifference, isolation, and abstinence from the religious and moral obligations of public education, good citizenship, sound government, social life and public morality. Christian Ethics comprehends all these things. If the Church in America has neglected them, it is because it has not apprehended and practised the heights and breadths of Christian Ethics.

The evil effects of the divorce of Church and State are mak-

ing it evident to thinking men in all denominations that in some way a concord must be established between the denominations, in order that the State may not obstruct the advance of Christianity in the nation, and put itself in opposition to the Church in the great religious and moral needs of humanity.

The so-called American theory of the separation of Church and State has had two results. 1. On the one side, the State has been relieved from the burdens of the support of the Church and the duties of religion. The influence of the Church upon the State is no longer direct, immediate, and pervasive as a recognised force influencing all actions; but it is indirect, subtile and mediate, through the influence of the Church upon its adherents among the various offices of the government. The State has been relieved of the support of the Church, and also to a great extent of higher education and of public charities. This enormous burden has thus been shifted from the shoulders of the whole people to the shoulders of the pious, benevolent and self-sacrificing citizens. The great mass of the indifferent, selfish and irreligious, whether poor, comfortable or rich, escape these burdens, which then fall upon a portion of the community in double measure. It is evident that many of the largest estates in America are in the hands of men who do little, if anything, for public charity, higher education and religion. It is easy to see what enormous savings they make in this respect when compared with the land-owners and bond-holders of other countries. The great moral, religious and educational forces which are most potent to protect their persons and property, are supported by others; and to this extent many of our millionaires are as truly dependent upon public charity as the beggars at their gates.

The United States Congress and the Legislatures of the several States pay little, if any, attention to the desires of the Christian public, as expressed in the various church courts. They are much more influenced by an organised body of merchants, whether this is composed of a few men at the head of

great trusts, or of many voters in various trade associations. The splitting up of the Church into so many conflicting denominations, and the organisation of ecclesiastical bodies without regard to the territorial divisions of the towns and States, have marred their influence. This has been overcome in recent years in several of the denominations by making the ecclesiastical territories correspond with the political. But much more needs to be accomplished in this regard. It is the better organisation of the Roman Catholic Church that gives it more influence with politicians. Let us not deceive ourselves by imagining that it is all due to the wiles of the Jesuits, or to the power of priests to influence voters. The Church has lost immensely in its influence upon the State. The Protestant Churches have less influence than the Roman Catholic, notwithstanding the Protestants are vastly greater in numerical strength, in wealth, in institutions of learning and in literature.

2. The Church has lost largely in its power to influence the State, but the State has gained largely in its influence over the Church. This has been in two directions.

(*a*) The State has the supreme authority over the Church in all material affairs—over its property, so far as the Church is a visible organisation; and over its communicants and its office-bearers, as having rights of contract, and as having character and reputation. It is really only in so far as the Church is immaterial that it is exempt from the authority of the State. The Church has no more freedom than a Masonic Lodge, or an association of liquor-dealers.

(*b*) The State has also a subtile influence upon the Church. The civil government and the civil courts have exerted an irresistible influence upon the ecclesiastical government and the ecclesiastical courts, and thereby modified to a great extent all religious organisations in the United States.

The Episcopal Churches have the executive department of Church government efficiently organised, and are ever ready to speak and act through the bishops. The non-Episcopal

Churches have no other executives than temporary moderators, presidents and clerks, who are unable to go beyond their instructions, and are not competent to act in the emergencies that may arise in the Church or the State, or in the complicated questions of education and social life. Banks and railroads, trusts and commercial companies, cannot get on without presidents. Academies have their principals, colleges and universities their presidents and chancellors. The city has its mayor, the State its governor, the United States their president. There can be no efficiency in commercial, social, educational and civil life without the executive head. The Church never can be efficient without such executives in the several grades of the territorial organisation. The inefficiency of Protestants is largely due to the neglect of the executive function of the Historical Episcopate.

Owing to the irresistible influence of the civil government upon the ecclesiastical government, the denominations have been gradually assimilated. Let any one compare the Congregationalists of New England with the Congregationalists of Old England, and he will see that the former have advanced very far in the direction of Presbyterianism, in the authority given to councils to license and to ordain ministers, to fellowship or disfellowship churches, and to legislate as to the common affairs of the denomination. It is true there is the old hostility to any claim of authority, but the authority is all the stronger that it is given in the form of counsel and fraternal advice.

The American Presbyterian Church has departed widely from the Westminster model in the constitution of the presbytery, in the theory of the ruling eldership and in methods of government and discipline. The theory that the ruling elders represent the people is an American Presbyterian doctrine that has been adopted from the representative theory of the American Republic. The Protestant Episcopal Church is very different from the Church of England in its government. Its two houses, its conventions, Diocesan and General, and their methods of government are more

like those of the American Presbyterian Church than those of the Church of England.

We are thus brought to this interesting situation, that the free Churches of the United States under the potent influence of the civil government—all the more powerful that it has been indirect and insensible—have assimilated themselves so far to the civil government and thereby also to each other, that in their ecclesiastical government they are at present not far apart, and that any one of the three types is nearer to the golden mean of parties in the seventeenth century. Why, then, should they any longer remain apart? The process of assimilation is so rapid, and the constraint of external necessity is so great that it is inevitable that they will somehow unite in the twentieth century, in spite of all traditions and of every opposition of dogmaticians and ecclesiastics. When they unite, it is inevitable that the unity of the organism will find expression in the executive functions of the Historic Episcopate.

II. THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE AS A TERM OF UNION

The Historic Episcopate is made the great question of difficulty by the fourth article of the proposition of the American House of Bishops and the Lambeth Conference. But it is really a no more difficult question than the *Historical Presbyter*. Before the reunion is accomplished each one of these offices must pass through the fire. I am not sure that it makes any very great difference where we begin. Possibly it may be as well that the Episcopal Churches should settle the question of the Historical Episcopate and that the Presbyterian Churches should determine the question of the Historical Presbyter.

But it is just here that one of the most interesting features of the situation meets us. The Episcopal Churches are no more agreed as to the Historical Episcopate than are the Presbyterian Churches as to the Historical Presbyterate. The Greek Church will not agree with the Roman; neither of

these will agree with the Anglican. Let any one consider the differences in the Church of England as represented by the three names, Hatch, Lightfoot and Gore. In view of this discord as to the Historical Episcopate, well known to the House of Bishops and the Lambeth Conference, it seems quite evident that these bishops, differing among themselves in their theory of the Episcopate, could not lay down a basis for the reunion of Christendom that would involve any particular theory of the Episcopate. They could only mean that which was essential to the Historical Episcopate, that to which divines like Hatch, Lightfoot and Gore could agree.

Many Presbyterians and Congregationalists have the feeling that it is the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Episcopate that the House of Bishops and the Lambeth Conference are proposing. This is favoured by the industry and boldness with which the Anglo-Catholic party are pressing their theory. But it seems incredible that the House of Bishops would propose a theory to which it would be difficult to rally a majority of the members of the Church of England.

It was well known to them that Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Lutherans could not accept the Anglo-Catholic theory. But there are multitudes of ministers in all the non-Episcopal Churches who are willing to accept the theory of the Episcopate of the late Dr. Hatch, and there are many who could adopt the theory of the late Bishop Lightfoot.

The progress of the discussion as to the *Historical Episcopate* teaches two lessons: (1) The Anglo-Catholics who really desire the reunion of Christendom should beware lest they make their theory of the Episcopate *essential.* They are entitled to argue for it to the extent of their ability; but they should understand that if they make their theory essential there is no possibility of reunion. They must first conquer other parties in the Episcopal Churches before they can have any prospect of overcoming the hosts in the non-Episcopal Churches, which, so far as my observation goes, are unanimous against them. (2) On the other hand, those who hold

that the Historical Episcopate is *jure humano* and not *jure divino*, that it has historic right, but no Biblical basis, should not make their views essential. The Anglo-Catholic theory has been in the Church of England from the beginning, and it would be a historical wrong to exclude it. I think that theory can be shown to be erroneous. Recent historical research is very damaging to all *jure divino* theories of Church government, but it is a tolerable error, and it should be recognised by all as a legitimate and a lawful theory of the Episcopate. These theories ought to coexist, and be mutually tolerant and forbearing. The question is to be determined by historic research, and not by dogmatic statements or ecclesiastical decisions.

The view that I have taken of the meaning of the Historical Episcopate as proposed by the House of Bishops and the Lambeth Conference as the fourth term of union is confirmed by one who seems to speak with authority. Dr. Vincent, the Bishop of Southern Ohio, tells us plainly:

> Nothing is said here of Episcopacy as of Divine institution or necessity, nothing of "Apostolic succession," nothing of a Scriptural origin or a doctrinal nature in the institution. It is expressly proposed here only in its "historical character" and as "locally adapted to the varying needs of God's people." All else, unless it he its Scripturalness, is matter of opinion, to which this Church has never formally committed herself. Her position here is the same hroad and generous one taken in the preface to her ordinal. That phrase, "the Historic Episcopate," was deliberately chosen as declaring not a doctrine hut a fact, and as heing general enough to include all variants.—(An address on *Christian Unity*, p. 29. Puhlished by the Cincinnati hranch of the Church Unity Society.)

This platform thus interpreted, is broad enough and strong enough for the feet of Presbyterians, and it contains nothing to which they can rightly object.

The non-Episcopal Churches are willing to consider the Historical Episcopate as *jure humano*, as not essential to the existence of the Church, but as important for its well-being. Not a few Presbyterians agree that the Presbyterian form of government, as now used in the Presbyterian Church, is

defective. It is impossible for a whole Presbytery to exercise Episcopal functions in any practical way. A committee of Presbytery is more efficient; but it has been the experience of committees that really the best committee is often a committee of *one,* and practically in all committees the chairman or secretary does the major part of the work. The Presbytery needs an executive head who shall be relieved from the cares of a local church and be consecrated to the superintendency of the whole Church in the limits of the Presbytery. Many Presbyterians feel the inefficiency of the Presbytery very keenly, and are prepared to advance to the permanent moderator or superintendent. The tendency in the Presbyterian Church is toward such a bishop, who will give the Presbytery an executive head and make it more efficient. The Episcopate has in its favour the historical usage of the Christian Church from the second century until the sixteenth. The Episcopate has in its favour also its continuance in several national Reformed Churches, showing that it is not inconsistent with the Reformation. History is a powerful argument for the Episcopate. This, added to the practical argument, makes the future of the Episcopate sure unless the old blunders should be renewed and perpetuated.

III. GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO EPISCOPACY

There are four reasons for opposition in the non-Episcopal Churches to the Historic Episcopate:—

1. The claim that the Diocesan Episcopacy has the Divine right of institution by Christ and his apostles.
2. The claim that the Diocesan bishops are the successors of the apostles.
3. The claim that ordination by Diocesan bishops has in it special grace without which there can be no valid ministry.
4. The claim that the Diocesan bishops have Divine authority to rule the Church.

These claims for the Diocesan Episcopate have been associated in the minds of the non-Episcopal ministry with all the tyranny and abuses that the Church has suffered at the hands of the Diocesan bishops. These claims are not recognised by the ministry of other Protestant Churches, and it is not at all likely that they ever will be recognised in the terms in which they have usually been presented. Unless the Historic Episcopacy can be eliminated from them, or these claims can be explained in accordance with the New Testament and primitive Christian history, the reunion of Christendom is improbable.

1. There is agreement among recent historical critics of all parties that there is no record of the institution of the Diocesan bishop in the New Testament. The only bishops of the New Testament are presbyter-bishops, and these are ever associated in a college or presbytery. Nowhere do we find a church under the guidance of *one* of these presbyter-bishops. Nowhere do we find more than one church in one city. Hatch, Lightfoot, Gore, Sanday, Harnack and Schaff are agreed as to this point. Hence the battle-cries of all the parties in the seventeenth century have happily disappeared in this new concord of Historical Criticism. There is no ecclesiastical organisation now in existence that corresponds with the organisation of the Church in the New Testament. Where do we find the independent church with a single pastor and a bench of deacons of modern Congregationalism? Where do we find the ruling elders with a presiding parochial bishop of modern Presbyterianism? Where do we find the diocesan bishop with his subordinate priests and deacons of the Episcopal Churches? None of these are in the New Testament. All *jure divino* theories of Church government that base their orders on the authority of the New Testament are, if not yet buried, inanimate corpses, slain by Historical Criticism. *Jure divino* Congregationalism and Presbyterianism have but few advocates at the present time. It is probable that it is the failure of the *jure divino* theory of the diocesan episcopate that has a great

deal to do with the advance of the Church of England and her daughters toward Church Unity.

Morin, the great Roman Catholic authority on ordinations, says that there are three theories as to the relation of bishops to presbyters. The first is that the bishops do not differ from presbyters. This was the view of Aërius which was rejected by the Church. The second theory is that the bishops are superior to presbyters by human right, the third that they are superior by divine right. The latter is the prevailing theory in the Roman Catholic Church, but not so as to regard the second theory as heretical. The two theories have been maintained in the Church from primitive times.[1]

2. The claim that bishops are the successors of the apostles is no longer defended on the ground of the New Testament, but on the ground of the history of the second Christian century. Early in the second century bishops appear at the head of colleges of presbyters in the leading churches of Asia; but it is admitted that these do not appear so early in the churches of Europe and Africa, where the churches were governed by colleges of presbyter-bishops. It is admitted that these bishops of the cities of Asia are not yet full diocesan bishops; they are parochial bishops, bishops of cities and towns where but one church existed so far as can be determined. These parochial bishops are more like the pastors of Presbyterian and Congregational churches than diocesan bishops, save that they are at the head of colleges of presbyter-bishops, to which modern Congregationalism has nothing to correspond save ruling deacons and for which Presbyterianism has no sufficient substitute in ruling elders. Such deacons and such elders have no counterpart in the second Christian century; and the breaking up of the Church of Christ into a number of different organisations in the same city, even if it be in the same general ecclesiastical organisation, was not dreamed of in the second century.

It is a plausible theory that the parochial bishops of Asia

[1] *Commentarius de Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinationibus*, 1655, Pars. III. Exercit. III. Cap. 3.

were ordained and installed, either by the hands of the apostles, or by those prophets, teachers and evangelists who had divine inspiration, and who appear in the New Testament as the assistants and deputies of the apostles in the organisation of the Church. Thus Lightfoot says:

"Though the New Testament itself contains as yet no direct and indisputable notices of a localised Episcopate in the Gentile churches, as distinguished from the movable Episcopate exercised by Timothy in Ephesus and by Titus in Crete, yet there is satisfactory evidence of its development in the later years of the Apostolic age; that this development was not simultaneous and equal in all parts of Christendom; that it is more especially connected with the name of St. John; and that in the early years of the second century the Episcopate was widely spread and had taken firm root, more especially in Asia Minor and in Syria." (*Epistles of St. Ignatius*, i., p. 376.)

It is also a legitimate theory that these parochial bishops were the historical successors of those assistants and deputies of the apostles, who were at first travelling apostles and evangelists, but who gradually became settled and permanent parochial bishops of the larger and more central Churches. As Gore says:

"We have no determining evidence (in the New Testament) as to the exact form which the ministry of the future was to take. . . . Were the local bishops to receive additional powers, such as would make them independent of any higher order? Or were the Apostles and Apostolic men, like Timothy and Titus, to perpetuate their distinct order? And if so, was it to be perpetuated as a localised or as a general order? These questions are still open." . . . "In the West no more than in the East did the supreme power ever devolve upon the presbyters. There was a time when they were (as the epistles of Clement and Polycarp bear witness) the chief *local* authorities—the sole ordinary occupants of the chief seat. But over them, not yet localised, were men either of prophetic inspiration or of Apostolic authority and known character—'prophets' or 'teachers' or 'rulers' or 'men of distinction'—who in the sub-Apostolic age ordained to the sacred ministry, and in certain cases would have exercised the chief teaching and governing authority. Gradually these men, after the pattern set by James in Jerusalem or by John in the churches of Asia, become themselves local presidents or instituted others in their place." (*Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 269, 270, 335.)

But giving all the importance to these theories to which they may be entitled, by pushing the evidence to the utmost extreme, we do not get any more than probable historical evidence for the parochial bishops as historical successors of the apostles. We are not on the ground of the divine right of the New Testament. We have nothing more than very ancient historic right for the historical Episcopate. On the other hand, the theory that the parochial bishop was a natural evolution of the college of presbyter-bishops; that it was inevitable that the college should have an executive head; and that with the growth of the Church, this presiding presbyter-bishop, who at first was temporary and changeable, or in the order of seniority, would become a permanent parochial bishop, having the administration of the affairs of the church of the city committed to his hands, without any ordering of the apostles and without any divine institution—this theory accounts for all the facts of history as they appear in the ancient documents.

We do not underrate the historical argument even when it comes so close to the apostles themselves and the prophets who were associated with them. But we claim that it is necessary to carefully distinguish it from the divine right of the New Testament. In the consideration of this difference I have been greatly impressed by the inconsistency with which many modern Presbyterians have become involved. The old Presbyterians were entirely consistent when they demanded a divine right from the New Testament itself for the ministry and the canon of Scripture. But modern Presbyterians who have so generally abandoned the argument from the testimony of the Holy Spirit for the canonicity of Scripture, and rest the authority of the Canon of Scripture upon the historical evidence connecting it with Apostolic penmen, can no longer with consistency insist upon a *jure divino* for Episcopacy in the New Testament and refuse the candid and firm historical argument of Bishop Lightfoot.

The modern Church cannot safely commit itself to any of these theories, for it is within the range of possibility that

ere long other early Christian documents may be discovered, of more importance than the *Teaching of the Apostles*, that will put the whole question in a new light. There can be no agreement except that the parochial bishop at the head of a presbytery of presbyter-bishops was a historic fact of the first half of the second Christian century, and that it became universal at the close of the century. Whether it rests upon apostolic authority, or the authority of the presbyter-bishops into whose hands the government of the Church was entrusted by the apostles, it is not necessary for us to determine. The New Testament gives us no *jure divino* on the subject. If it were an essential question, it is reasonable to suppose there would have been a *jure divino* determination of it. The Churches may agree upon the historic fact; they do not agree upon the divine institution.

The twelve apostles had a unique office, to bear witness to what they had seen of the historic Christ, his life, his teachings, his death on the cross, his resurrection, his ascension, the Christophanies of the enthroned Saviour. No successors could fulfil this office. The other parts of their office, teaching, governing, administration of the sacraments, they transmitted to others. In the New Testament the presbyter-bishops are seen doing all these things. They could transmit these things to their successors without any need of a higher order, superintending them and governing them. It seems to most historical critics that this very thing they did. If others find comfort in a theory that the apostles or apostolic men of a higher order than presbyters had a hand in instituting the parochial bishops, no objection should be taken to the theory, if held as a theory, and not urged as essential to the existence of the Church. But the early second century gives us only the parochial bishop. The diocesan bishop and the village bishop were later developments. Certainly these had no institution from the hands of the apostles or apostolic men. We may accept the diocesan bishop as a historic evolution in the growth of the Church under the guidance of the Divine Spirit; but we cannot ac-

cept the diocesan bishop as linked by apostolic succession as a distinct order to the ordaining hands of the apostles. The ordination of presbyter-bishops may be linked to apostolic hands by the testimony of the New Testament. The ordination of the parochial bishop may be linked to apostolic hands by a plausible interpretation of historical facts. But the diocesan bishop is an evolution out of the parochial bishop, and the only apostolic succession he has is through the parochial bishop, or possibly only through the presbyter-bishops.

3. The claim that ordination by diocesan bishops has special grace, without which there is no valid ministry, is the most objectionable of all the claims that are put forth on behalf of the Historic Episcopate at the present time. There is no evidence for this in the New Testament, or in the second Christian century. The New Testament tells us of ordination by a presbytery of presbyter-bishops, but gives us no example of ordination by a parochial bishop, still less of ordination by a diocesan bishop. The Presbyterian Churches claim that their ordination by presbyter-bishops is in accordance with the example of the New Testament, and that the apostolic succession has been regularly transmitted through the centuries in the laying on of hands of these presbyter-bishops. At the Reformation some of the National Churches of northern Europe laid aside the diocesan bishops, and by the highest authority in those Churches gave the entire authority of the ministry to the presbyter-bishops, meeting in Presbytery. Presbyterian ministers have been ordained by the laying on of hands of presbyter-bishops, in regular succession from presbyter-bishops ordained by diocesan bishops at the head of bodies of presbyter-bishops. Gore admits:

"that the Church principle of succession would never be violated by the existence in any Church of episcopal powers, whether free or conditional, in all the presbyters, supposing that those powers were not assumed by the individual for himself, but were understood to be conveyed to him by the ordination of the Church." (*Ministry of the Christian Church*, 1889, p. 143.)

Now this is precisely the case with the Reformed National Churches of Europe. The Churches of Switzerland, Germany and Scotland were reformed in doctrine and discipline by the same authority as the Church of England; namely, the authority lodged in the National Church itself. It is quite evident that the National Church was less free to reform itself and more hindered in its development in England than in any other Protestant country. The diocesan bishops were deposed for tyranny, immorality and heresy in many of the Reformed Churches in an orderly way. In those countries where diocesan bishops led or followed the National Churches in their reform, they were retained. But where they were deposed, and discontinued in the interests of the good order and discipline of the Church, the whole authority of the Church was given over into the hands of the presbyter-bishops. Did these National Churches die with their deposed diocesan bishops? Was there no inherent authority in the Church to govern itself when its historic bishops had left it in the lurch? Even granting that, in the interests of good order, ordination by a diocesan bishop at the head of a Presbytery is important to a valid ministry, yet the disorders of the Reformation, and the separation of the bishops from the Churches of the Reformation, left the National Churches in such an abnormal condition that the only ordained ministry left to them were obliged to exercise all the functions of the ministry. Their acts, even if irregular and disorderly, were therefore valid, because they were not the usurped authority of individuals; they were the authority of organised National Churches, in accordance with national law and order. Gore says:

"It cannot be maintained that the acts of ordination by which presbyters of the sixteenth or subsequent centuries originated the ministries of some of these societies, were covered by their commissions or belonged to the office of presbyter, which they had received." (*Ministry of the Christian Church*, 1889, p. 344.)

But this is precisely what has been maintained in the Lutheran

and Reformed Churches from the beginning. The Westminster Directory teaches:

(1) No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling [John iii. 27; Rom. x. 14, 15; Jer. xiv. 14; Heb. ix. 4]; (2) Ordination is always to be continued in the Church [Job i. 5; I Tim. v. 21, 22]; (3) Ordination is the solemn setting apart of a person to some publique Church office [Num. viii. 10, 11, 14, 19, 22; Acts vi. 3, 5, 6]; (4) Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong [I Tim. v. 22; Acts xiv. 23; xiii. 3]; (5) The power of ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole Presbytery [I Tim. iv. 14].

It is not presbyters gathered in societies who ordain, but presbyters organized in a Presbytery for the government and discipline of the Church. These presbyters claim apostolic succession through the laying on of hands of presbyters in successive generations, leading back to the apostles in the New Testament times. These Presbyteries claim succession to the Presbyteries that have governed the Church in all ages under various names. Church authority was not destroyed when the presiding bishops were lawfully deposed and the office of diocesan bishop was for good reasons discontinued. The whole authority of ordination fell to the whole Presbytery or whole body of Presbyters organised as National Churches.

Gore also says, "Beyond all question they 'took to themselves' these powers of ordination, and consequently had them not."[1] But Presbyterians claim, on the contrary, that they did have these powers of ordination by right of succession and that they did not take them to themselves, and that they consequently had them. They not only had them by transmission in ordination by presbyters and diocesan bishops, but they had them by becoming, through the deposition of the diocesan bishops, and the commission into their hands by the General Assembly of the National Church, and

[1] *Ministry of the Christian Church*, 1889, p. 345.

by the consent of the National Parliament, the seat of the whole authority in the National Church. There was no more a taking to themselves powers of ordination by Scotch, Swiss, French, Dutch and German presbyters in these National Churches of Northern Europe than there was in the case of the Protestant bishops of the Church of England who were deposed by the Roman Church, and whose authority to ordain has never since been recognised by the Roman Church. Did the deposed diocesan bishops retain in their hands the sole authority to ordain in the National Church, and were the whole body of presbyters and the people and Parliament doing unlawful acts in vindicating the purity of the Church, its orthodoxy, and the divine rights of Jesus Christ? God forbid! The accident or good providence that enabled the Church of England to advance into the Reformation with her bishops at her head, does not entitle that Church to lord it over other National Churches, or to claim the only valid ministry in Protestantism. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the continent of Europe and the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches of Great Britain and America challenge comparison with the Church of England and her daughters in this respect.

The ministry of Churches that honour the names of Luther and Melancthon, Zwingli and Calvin, Bucer and Peter Martyr, Knox and Alasco, and a host more of the greatest men of modern times, will never dishonour the memory of these heroes of the Faith by denying the validity of their ministry. The reunion of Christendom at such a cost would be a dishonourable transaction. Presbyterians and Congregationalists will continue to honour the memories of Cartwright and Travers in their contest with Whitgift and Hooker; of Marshall, Palmer and Baxter in their contest with Laud, Hall and Taylor; of Robinson and his band of Separatists who founded the Plymouth Colony; of the patriarch White of Dorchester and his associates, who founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony; of Melville, Welch, Livingston and Rutherford, and a host of brave Presbyterians

and Congregationalists, who battled against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of bishops and king. Such names as Cartwright, Melville, Baxter and Bunyan shine among the heroes of the Faith. Such bishops as Whitgift and Laud no modern Church would tolerate for a moment. The English people of our day would hurl such bishops from their thrones with thunderbolts of wrath.

The opinion of Gore with reference to the orders of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of the continent of Europe, is the evil tradition that has come down in the Anglican Church from the Laudian party at the Restoration of Charles II. It is entirely contrary to the best Anglican authorities prior to the civil wars o the reign of Charles I and II, as represented by Hooker, Field, Mason, Joseph Hall and many others, who all regarded the orders of the Reformed Churches of the Continent as valid.

4. The claim that bishops have Divine authority to rule the Church was pressed in former times. But unless we mistake, it has been for the most part abandoned in Great Britain and America. The fight against Episcopal usurpation and tyranny has been fought to the end; and the Church of England and her daughters are now among the freest and most tolerant Churches in Christendom. There is much more of tyranny in modern Presbyterianism, and even in modern Congregationalism, than there is in the Historic Episcopate, as it is now known in Great Britain and America.

None of these four claims that have been associated with Historic Episcopacy would be recognised by the ministry of the non-Episcopal Churches. Many are willing that all who desire to make these claims should do so for their own comfort and edification, in so far as they do not force them upon others, or endeavour to make them the law of the Church of Christ. They do not follow the ancient Puritans in rejecting them as anti-Christian errors. They do not agree with the old Presbyterians in casting out *jure divino* Episcopacy in order to set up *jure divino* Presbytery. Cartwright and

Travers were as much in error on the one side as Laud and his followers on the other.

We have to consider under the Historical Episcopate that which is essential to it as a bond of union, and not those unessential theories and claims that have been put forth by certain parties in its behalf. These are but the outer garments of the Historical Episcopate, that may be exchanged for other robes. These are the features that may be pleasant for some parties to look upon, and we shall not deny them their pleasure in them. But when the proposition of the House of Bishops is adopted, "the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church," then, if we mistake not, all these unessential things will be referred to the special charge of a party in the Church to nurse them and care for their future, while all other parties will agree with that party in rallying round the Historical Episcopate in its essential features as seen in all lands and in all times, taking form in the several dioceses as the conditions and circumstances may require.

IV. THE ADVANTAGE OF THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

Where, then, is the advantage of the Historic Episcopate? Where is the *substance* in which all Episcopal Churches and parties are agreed, and to which it is probable non-Episcopal Churches will adhere, in order to the reunion of Christendom?

1. *The Historic Episcopate was a Historical Evolution in Church Government.* Although there were no other bishops in New Testament times than presbyters, yet it was a legitimate and inevitable result of a bench or body of presbyters that one should have the management of affairs, be the executive head and preside over the government of the local Church. The presiding bishop therefore sprang up in the latter part of the first century, or early in the second century. At first this bishop was a parochial bishop. There was but one church organisation in the city, with missions in the sub-

urban villages. The unity of the Church maintained itself with its increase in size, so that in the latter part of the second century, or early in the third century, the parochial Presbytery had grown into a diocesan Presbytery, and the parochial bishop into a diocesan bishop, and later chor-episcopi, or pastors of village churches, came into the field. The system continued to develop in history until the archbishop and patriarch and Pope, one after the other, gave expression to the higher unities of the growing Church of Christ. The Historic Episcopate is a historical evolution. It has a vast variety of form in history. At what stage in the development shall we take it as a basis of union? The Roman Church presents us the system in its highest form in the Pope. The Greek and Oriental Churches give us an earlier stage in the patriarch. The Church of England presents us the still earlier stage in the archbishop. The American Episcopal Church does not rise higher than the diocesan bishop. The Presbyterian Church goes farther back to the parochial bishop. What Church is there that goes back to the earlier form of government as it appears in the New Testament, with a bench of parochial presbyter-bishops under apostolic oversight? Not one. They all have made the mistake of pleading a *jure divino*, while they all represent a later stage of *jure humano* development. At what stage, then, shall we take our stand for Church Unity? What is the essence of the Historical Episcopate in which all can agree?

It was the tyranny of the bishops, and their close alliance with the Crown, that forced the reforming party in the State as well as in the Church to take ground against them. The King was the supreme bishop of the Church of England, and became a national pope.

There was nothing in the principles of the Reformation that at all interfered with the Episcopal office. There was nothing in Puritanism that forced the abolition of the Episcopate. Some of the ablest archbishops and bishops of England and Ireland were Puritans. It was more the evolution of civil politics and the political complications of the bishops

that made the difficulty in Great Britain. Whitgift and Laud did more to injure the Episcopate in Protestantism than any other agency whatever. The opposition to the Episcopate in Presbyterian circles is a traditional opposition that goes back to the Laudian usurpation and the civil and religious wars that followed. Presbyterians are under historical bonds to accept the Episcopate of Abbot and Ussher.

The difficulty is not to be solved by stopping at any of the stages in the historical evolution of the Episcopate, whether with the parochial bishop, the diocesan bishop, the archbishop, the patriarch or the Pope. The whole process is a natural evolution of the Historical Episcopate. As I have recently said:

> Christendom might unite with an ascending series of superintending bishops that would culminate in a universal bishop, provided the pyramid would be willing to rest firmly on its base, the solid order of the presbyter-bishops of the New Testament and of all history, and all Churches. But the pyramid will never stand on its apex, nor hang suspended in the air supported by any of its upper stages. (*Whither?* p. 238.)

It seems to me that the solution is not in going backward, but *forward*. History speaks very strongly for the Historical Episcopate. My historic sense not only gives me great respect and veneration for the office, but also leads me to the opinion that the Church, guided by the Divine Spirit, did not err in its Episcopal government through all these centuries. The abandonment of the Episcopate was not a natural result of the Reformation. It was not a part of the Lutheran movement. The national Lutheran Church of Sweden has retained bishops until the present day. Sweden claims apostolical succession for her bishops. The Episcopal office was restored to Denmark, but the first bishops were ordained by Bugenhagen.[1] Bishops continued at the head of the Reformed Churches of Prussia and Brandenburg for a long time. England began with bishops. Scotland had superintending bishops. It was the jealousy that princes

[1] *Briefwechsel Zwischen H. L. Martensen und I. A. Dorner*, I. s. 238.

in Germany felt of the Episcopal prerogative that prevented the Lutheran Church from having Diocesan bishops. However, superintendents were appointed to exercise all the functions of the Episcopate in the larger portion of Germany and Austria.

2. *The Historical Episcopate is the Crown of Presbyterian Government.* It was so historically; it is so practically. Therefore Presbyterians should be willing to accept it as such. They are not willing to accept the theory of the *three orders*, in the usual sense of implying a third degree of ministerial character; but many are willing to accept the bishop as the executive head, the first among his brethren, the most honoured, the most efficient of them all. It is the theory of apostolic *orders* that makes the difficulty in the Historical Episcopacy. They can agree upon orders, as differences in rank *jure humano*, for the well-being of the Church, so far as these higher orders are higher by election of their brethren, and not higher by descent of apostolical succession. They might agree to bishop, archbishop, patriarch and Pope, if these were all chosen by the Church in stage upon stage of advancement toward the executive head of the Church. But they would not agree that the bishops have any exclusive Divine right to transmit the Episcopal order. They might be willing, in other words, to agree to the whole system of Episcopal orders even up to a Papal head, but would not be willing to agree to theories of higher orders, which are associated with prerogative, pride, ambition, tyranny and despotism. They might be willing to recognise all sorts of theories of the Episcopate and tolerate all kinds of human weakness and follies in bishops. They could not unite on any of the theories of the Historical Episcopate, but they might unite on the Historical Episcopate itself. And if the Anglo-Catholics desire to conserve any rites and ceremonies in the way of consecration and ordination by bishops, they should concede to others the Presbyterial election, Episcopal responsibility to synods or conventions in which presbyters shall have their rights; and they should put such checks

upon episcopal authority as will prevent any of those evils from which the Church suffered so much in the past.

It is interesting to observe just here two historical facts: (1) What the Presbyterians offered in 1661, as their ultimatum; and (2) What is the actual condition of the Historical Episcopate in America, when compared with this ultimatum.

The Presbyterial ultimatum of 1661 was given in the Proposals of the Presbyterian ministers, drawn up after nearly three weeks' debate, in Sion College, in which Edmund Calamy, Reynolds, Newcommen and Baxter had the chief hand.

That although upon just reasons we do dissent from that ecclesiastical hierarchy or prelacy disclaimed in the Covenant, as it was stated and exercised in these kingdoms, yet we do not, nor ever did renounce the true ancient and primitive presidency as it was ballanced and managed by a due commixture of presbyters therewith, as a fit means to avoid corruptions, partiality, tyranny, and other evils which may be incident to the administration of one single person, which kind of attempered presidency, if it shall be your Majesty's grave wisdom and gracious moderation, be in such manner constituted as that the forementioned and other like evils may be certainly prevented, we shall humbly submit thereunto.

And in order to a happy accommodation in this weighty business, we desire humbly to offer unto your Majesty some of the particulars which we conceive were unwise in the Episcopal government, as it was practised before the year 1640.

1. The great extent of the Bishop's Diocese, which was much too large for his own personal inspection, wherein he undertook a pastoral charge over the souls of all those within his bishoprick, which must needs be granted to be too heavy a burthen for any one man's shoulders, the Pastoral office being a work of personal ministration and trust, and that of the highest concernment to the souls of the people, for which they are to give an account to Christ.

2. That by reason of this disability to discharge their duty and trust personally, the bishops did depute the administration of much of their trust, even in matters of spiritual cognizance, to commissaries, chancellors, and officials, whereof some were secular persons, and could not administer that power which originally appertaineth to the pastors of the Church.

3. That those bishops who affirm the Episcopal office to be a distinct order by Divine right from that of the Presbyter, did assume the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction to themselves.

4. That some of the bishops exercised an arbitrary power as by sending forth the Books of Articles in their Visitations, and therein unwarrantably enquiring into several things, and swearing the churchwardens to present accordingly. So also by many innovations and ceremonies imposed upon ministers and people not required by law, and by suspending ministers at their pleasure.

In reforming of which evils, we humbly crave leave to offer unto your Majesty,—

1. The late most reverend primate of Ireland his Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government, received in the ancient Church, as a ground work towards an accommodation and fraternal agreement in this point of Ecclesiastical government,—which we rather do, not only in regard of his eminent piety and singular Ability as in all other parts of Learning so in that especially of the Antiquities of the Church, but also because therein expedients are offered for healing these grievances.

And in order to the same end, we further humbly desire that the suffragans or chorepiscopi, mentioned in the Primate's Reduction, may be chosen by the respective synods, and by that Election be sufficiently authorised to discharge their Trust. That the Associations may not be so large as to make the Discipline impossible, or to take off the ministers from the rest of their necessary imployments.

That no oaths nor promises of obedience to the Bishops, nor any unnecessary subscriptions or engagements be made necessary to ordination, institution, induction, ministration, communion, or immunities of ministers, they being responsible for any transgression of the Law.

And that no Bishops nor any ecclesiastical governors may at any time exercise their government by their own private will or pleasure, but only by such rules, canons, and constitutions as shall be hereafter by Act of Parliament ratified and established; and that sufficient provision be made to secure both ministers and people against the evils of Arbitrary Government in the Church.

These Presbyterian proposals were rejected by the bishops in 1661. But unless we mistake, every one of these Presbyterian Proposals has been complied with by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. Baxter said in 1691:

Oh, how little would it have cost your Churchmen in 1660 and 1661 to have prevented the calamitous and dangerous divisions of this land, and our common dangers thereby and the hurt that many hundred thousand souls have received by it? And how little would it cost them *yet to prevent the continuance of it.* (*Penitent Confession, Preface.*)

If the Church of England and the American Protestant Episcopal Church are now willing to pay this small cost, it is no time for Presbyterians to increase their demands. They should vie with their Episcopal brethren in generosity and self-sacrifice. I believe that ere long Presbyterians will accept the Proposals of the House of Bishops, and thus show that they have the same spirit of accommodation and desire for the unity of Christ's Church that their fathers showed in the proposals of 1661. After more than two centuries a House of Bishops has accepted all that their fathers proposed.

3. *Episcopal ordination and Presbyterian ordination are not inconsistent but complementary.* A Presbyterian minister is ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery with a moderator at their head. The ordination is the act of the whole body organised for the government of the congregations and presbyters within its bounds. The Episcopal minister is ordained by the laying on of the hands of the bishop, with two or more attending presbyters. We shall place the directory and the ordinal side by side for comparison.

ORDINAL	DIRECTORY
The bishop, with the priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of priesthood, the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the bishop saying, "Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the Church of GOD, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands."	The candidate shall kneel down in the most convenient part of the Church. Then the presiding minister shall, by prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, according to the Apostolic example, solemnly ordain him to the holy office of the gospel ministry. Prayer being ended, he shall rise from his knees; and the minister who presides first and afterward all the members of the Presbytery in their order, shall take him by the right hand, saying, in words to this purpose, "We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part of this ministry with us."

In this ceremony the presiding minister is to be compared with the bishop, and the Presbytery with the two or more presbyters associated with the bishop. There is the same ceremony essentially, but there are two striking differences: (*a*) In the one case the bishop presides and directs the ceremony of ordination. The bishop is the permanent head of the diocese, and the authority of the diocese centres in him. He has been chosen bishop because he is the most honoured, the most revered and the most efficient of the presbyters. His presidency is permanent, and thereby of higher rank, giving to the whole service dignity and unity. The presiding minister of the Presbytery may be, by a system of rotation, one of the younger members of the Presbytery. He adds no dignity to the occasion, and if it should happen, as it not infrequently does, that he presides for the first time, his presiding in the ordination lacks grace and propriety, and in so far disturbs the solemnity of the occasion. Unless we mistake, it is a common experience in connection with the ceremony of Presbyterian ordination that candidates, presbyters and people all alike regret that some other more honoured and more graceful presbyter had not been called upon to preside. A shifting moderator lacks the propriety, grace and dignity attached to the presidency of the bishop in the government and in the ceremonies of the Church. Episcopal ordination therefore is greatly to be preferred to ordination by a temporary presiding presbyter.

(*b*) On the other hand, we have to compare the two or more presbyters who are associated with the bishop in episcopal ordination, with the body of presbyters, organised as a Presbytery, who take part in presbyterial ordination. This body of presbyters, embracing the pastors of the congregations and other grave and venerable members who may be present, all with their hands upon the head of the candidate, and subsequently giving him the right hand of fellowship, make the ceremony a very impressive one, that is never forgotten by the ordained. This impressiveness, this weight of authority, this extent of influence, seems to be

lacking in the Episcopal ceremony. Presbyterian ordination is the official act of the entire body of ministers in the Presbytery, and therefore of the Presbyterian Church as such, in the exercise of its Presbyterial functions. Episcopal ordination lacks this authority of the organised Presbytery, and concentrates the attention upon the authority of the bishop. It is a common theory, if we mistake not, in the Episcopal Churches that the presbyters are merely attendants on the bishop and that they do not represent the body of presbyters in their act. It seems to be the common opinion that the term "*our* hands" in the Ordinal does not refer to the hands of bishop and presbyters, but only to the bishop's hands, speaking as the head of the Church.

The Bishop of Salisbury states it mildly when he says:

> As regards the position of Presbyters who assist in the ordination of other Presbyters, I feel great reluctance to acquiesce in the position that they are mere witnesses although that is, I believe, the ordinary assumption. They represent the Presbyterate or 'Sacerdotium' receiving new members into its order, and, whether they actually touch the heads of the ordinands or not, their presence and prayers are an ordinary part of the mystery of ordination considered as a means of grace. (*The Ministry of Grace*. American 2d edition, pp. 168–9.)

When the two ceremonies are compared, each has its advantages and its disadvantages. If the bishop took the place of the presiding minister, or moderator, in the Directory of Worship, and the Presbytery took the place of the two or more attending presbyters of the Ordinal, the two ceremonies would be equally improved by becoming identical. When the happy union is consummated, Episcopacy and Presbytery may each contribute an equal share to a Church that will be higher, better and more efficient than either.

V

THE VALIDITY OF ORDERS

I. THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION

THE Validity of Orders depends upon the Apostolic Commission perpetuated in unbroken succession of the ministry in the Christian Church. The Lord commissioned the Twelve shortly before his final departure from earth to the Father. There are several reports of the commission in the Gospels, the relative value of which is much disputed in the Church. These I have discussed at length elsewhere.[1]

The chief commission, in its original form in the Logia of Matthew, was, as I suppose:

> All authority hath been given unto me:
> Go ye therefore into all the earth,
> And make disciples of all nations,
> Baptise them into my name,
> And teach them to keep my commands;
> And I am with you unto the end.
> Matt. xxviii. 18–20 (*cf.* Mk. xvi. 15–18).

This commission imparts the authority of the Lord to the Twelve to enter upon a world-wide ministry. This ministry consists in these things: (1) They were to make all nations disciples of Christ. (2) They were to baptise them into his name, which became in our Gospel of Matthew, "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," involving a recognition of Jesus as the Christ, and subsequently of the Holy Trinity. (3) They were to teach the commands of Christ and see to it that these commands were executed.

[1] *The Apostolic Commission*, in the Vol. *Studies in Honour of Basil L. Gildersleeve*, 1902, pp. 1 *f.* *Cf. Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 229 *f.*

Another form of the commission is this:

> And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever (sins) ye retain, they are retained. John xx. 22–23 (*cf.* Matt. xvi. 17–19; xviii. 15–20).

Another, and indeed a distinct commission, was given in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper, according to I Cor. xi. 24, "This do in remembrance (or commemoration) of me." But these words are not in the original report of Mark as taken up into Matthew and the original Luke.[1] In later texts of Luke they have come in from the Epistle to the Corinthians. I have no doubt that those words are substantially correct; but it is not certain whether they are inferential on the part of St. Paul or whether Jesus actually said them. And it is improbable in view of their absence from the Gospels that they were uttered by Jesus on the night of his betrayal. At all events, if these authors knew of them, they did not regard them as important for their purpose; and we cannot rightly base the entire apostolic commission upon them. The Gospels all give apostolic commissions. They evidently did not regard this as a commission or they would have given it. This is confirmed by the commission of St. Paul which he received, not from the Twelve, but from Jesus himself in theophany. This commission corresponds with those given by Jesus to the Twelve according to the Gospels, and St. Paul was not specially commissioned by Jesus to celebrate the Eucharist.

There are several other places in the Gospels where the Twelve and the Seventy receive special commissions; but those given above are the principal ones upon which the several theories of the Christian ministry depend.

It is evident from them that our Lord commissioned the Twelve with his authority over his Kingdom or Church, and that this authority was to be exercised in the use of the functions of prophecy, priesthood and royalty, reflecting

[1] *Cf. Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 122 *f.*

his own authority in these three spheres. They had (1) prophetic authority to preach and to teach; (2) priestly authority to celebrate the sacraments of baptism and of the Lord's Supper and conduct the worship of the Church; (3) royal authority to organise the Church, and to govern, and discipline the disciples whom they received into the Church by baptism and whom they retained in the fellowship of the Holy Communion. In the first of these commissions the prophetic authority is most prominent, in the second the power of the keys, in the third the priestly or sacramental function. But they all are involved in the true functions and full commission of the apostolate and their successors in the Christian ministry. It would be unbiblical to exaggerate or to depreciate any one of them. When our Lord gave any one of them he did not mean to exalt it above the others, or to exclude any of the others. All of the functions alike are involved and in harmonious proportions in the Apostolic Commission.

It is quite true that the whole Christian community as one body, one Church, the Kingdom of God, was "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for (God's) own possession";[1] inasmuch as the Christian Church inherited the original covenant of Horeb, in which Israel was taken to be "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation";[2] but Jesus Christ as the son of the Father, the great high priest after the order of Melchizedek, the prophet and king of the Kingdom of God, committed his authority while absent from this earth to a ministering body which should exercise all these functions on his behalf and for the benefit of the entire Kingdom, so that all disciples become "fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone."[3]

[1] I Peter ii. 9. [2] Ex. xix. 6. [3] Eph. ii. 19–20.

II. PRESBYTER BISHOPS

The Twelve in their ministry transferred their apostolic authority by ordination to the presbyter bishops which were ordained over the churches organised by them in the different cities where they made disciples. Such presbyter bishops were ordained by the authority of the Twelve in Jerusalem[1] and by St. Paul in the several churches which he founded.[2] These presbyter bishops received authority for the whole work of the ministry in the localities where they were appointed. So St. Paul exhorts the presbyters of Ephesus: "Take heed unto yourselves and to the flock, in which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood."[3]

These presbyter bishops were the only local authorities over the churches known to the New Testament. There were, however, other apostles than the Twelve, such as St. Paul and St. Barnabas ordained to a general ministry over the churches which they founded. These were ordained by prophets and teachers of the church of Antioch.[4] These prophets and teachers, as well as the many others which are mentioned in the book of Acts and the Epistles, must have been ordained by the Twelve or others to whom they had committed the ministry. St. Paul's disciples, Silas, Titus, Timothy and others, were commissioned by him at times with a general superintendence over the work of the churches with authority to ordain presbyters therein.[5] Ordination to this general work of the ministry was not reserved by the apostles to themselves. St. Paul and St. Barnabas were ordained by prophets and teachers at Antioch. They did not go up to Jerusalem to be ordained by the Twelve. Timothy was ordained by "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." St. Paul's reference to this, in connection with the

[1] Acts xi. 30; xv. 6, 22.
[2] Acts xiv. 23; xx. 17.
[3] Acts xx. 28.
[4] Acts xiii. 1–3.
[5] I Cor. viii. 6 *sq.*; I Tim. iv. 6 *sq.*, v. 22; Titus i. 5.

general ministry of Timothy about which he is speaking, seems to exclude any higher or subsequent ordination.

These general ministers, who were so numerous and necessary in the Apostolic Age of the founding of Christian churches, gradually disappear in the second Christian century, and the authority of the Christian ministry appears as localised in Jerusalem, Antioch and the churches of Asia in a monarchial parochial episcopate with a higher jurisdiction than presbyters. In the churches of Corinth, Alexandria, and apparently in Rome, and so probably throughout the West, the churches were under the authority of a college of presbyter bishops.

But early in the third century the monarchical episcopate had become universal in the Christian Church, and there were no longer presbyter bishops, but bishops with a higher jurisdiction and presbyters with a lower jurisdiction in the Christian ministry The bishops differed from the presbyters not in ministerial functions but only in jurisdiction. The bishop had the same three functions of prophecy, priesthood and royalty as his presbyters. He differed from them in his executive headship and higher and more general supervision and jurisdiction over the local church.

How then did these monarchical bishops originate? There are three theories. (1) They were appointed and consecrated by the apostles. This is possible so far as Jerusalem, Antioch and the churches of Asia are concerned, although there is no record or suggestion of it in the New Testament, but it is then difficult to understand how the churches of Corinth and Alexandria, not to speak of Rome, could be without them, if they were a real apostolic institution.

(2) They originated from the localisation of the apostles and prophets when their general ministry was no longer required. But there is no evidence of such a localisation in any particular case, and it is difficult to see how a general authority over a number of churches could be reduced to a particular jurisdiction over a single church, for it is certain that these primitive bishops were bishops of cities or parishes,

not bishops of dioceses or provinces. A general authority might become localised in a province, but hardly in a city.

(3) The most natural explanation is that the monarchical episcopate was a normal development of the executive office, the temporary president of the college of presbyters gradually becoming the permanent president, with the general oversight which justifies the name of bishop, while the college of presbyters retained the older title of presbyters.

However we may explain the elevation of the bishop above the presbyters, it is evident that it was a normal and valid Christian institution, which gradually originated in the Church under the guidance of the divine Spirit, and which developed still further into archbishop, patriarch and pope, just as the diaconate also developed downward into five minor orders in the early Church. In this enlargement of the Christian ministry, however, the essential ministry remained through all history in the presbyter, for he always had in himself the three functions of prophecy, priesthood and royalty, which the deacon and the lower orders had not, and which the bishop in various grades of the hierarchy had no more than he.

For the perpetuation of the Christian ministry a valid ordination is necessary. That ordination has always from the beginning of the Christian Church been by the laying on of the hands of presbyters. The presbyters have all the functions of the Christian ministry and they alone can transmit them to others. So soon as the bishop was raised to a higher jurisdiction than presbyter, the bishop became the most prominent person in ordinations; but in ordinations he did not act alone but associated presbyters with himself in the laying on of hands; and his part in the ceremony, so far as the transmission of ministerial functions was concerned, was that of a ministering presbyter equally with other presbyters. That which was the bishop's own to impart was the authority from his higher jurisdiction to exercise those functions.

St. Timothy was ordained by presbyters; St. Paul and

St. Barnabas by prophets and teachers; there is no evidence from the New Testament that any other ordination was required. When the church of Alexandria changed its presbyterial college into a monarchical episcopate, it was doubtless presbyters that appointed the bishop. He did not go elsewhere for episcopal consecration; and there is no evidence that he was consecrated even by presbyters. His presbyterial ordination was adequate for the exercise of his episcopal jurisdiction as well as for his functions as presbyter. If, in later times, episcopal consecration was required by Canon Law, that was in the interests of law and order and propriety, not at all in the interest of validity of orders.

Langen, the Old Catholic professor at Bonn, thinks that the names of the first popes, Linus, Anencletus, Clement, all belonged to the college of presbyters in Rome.[1] Wordsworth[2] agrees with him and says that the episcopate in Rome in the Ignatian sense would date from the time of Pius. Whether the change dates from Pius or from earlier or later presiding presbyters, this theory best explains the variations in the order of names of the oldest lists of popes and also the fact that Clement writes as a presbyter to the church of Corinth with the authority of the church of Rome. Turmel does not succeed in overcoming this opinion.[3]

The episcopal succession does not depend upon any theory as to its origin. The president of a college of presbyters transmits succession just as truly as a monarchical bishop or an imperial pope. When the Reunion of Christendom shall eventually take place, the imperial papacy will doubtless become a limited monarchy and probably a republican presidency, without in any way impairing the succession or the essential nature of the papacy as the supreme jurisdiction of the Church. The president of the United States has greater plenitude of jurisdiction than the King of England or the Emperor of Austria. The title of Pope amounts to little, for

[1] *Gesch. der Röm. Kirche.* Bd. I s. 100, 101.
[2] *Ministry of Grace.* Am. edition, p. 131.
[3] *Histoire du dogma de la Papauté*, pp. 58 *f.*

it is a common title of a Russian priest, and means nothing more than father, the common title of a Roman priest.

The question of the Validity of Orders is a question which has become of great importance, owing to the divisions in the Western Church since the great Reformation of the sixteenth century and to subsequent controversies and divisions among Protestants. Hundreds of volumes and tracts have been written on all sides of this question; but almost all of them have been polemic in character. They have used the methods of an advocate rather than those of a sincere searcher for truth and fact. They have usually misunderstood or misrepresented the real facts of the case, and it is a dreary task to eliminate fact from fiction and truth from theorising. But the methods of Historical Criticism gradually dispel the mists of controversy, and it is evident that the entire question depends upon a few simple facts and truths.

The Roman Catholic Church recognises the validity of Orders in the heretical Churches of the East and the schismatic Greek Church. They are irregular and have no proper jurisdiction, but they are valid so far as ministerial functions are concerned; and so the question of validity of Orders does not arise in connection with propositions for unity with the Greek and Oriental Churches. The situation is, however, entirely different with the Protestant Churches. Rome does not recognise the ordination of any of the ministers of the Protestant Churches as valid. And among Protestants the validity of presbyterial Orders is questioned by the common traditions of the Church of England and her daughters since the latter half of the seventeenth century. It is necessary for us to consider the question first in connection with these controversies, and then we shall be prepared to discuss the whole question on the basis of certain great historical principles.

III. THE VALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDERS

The question of the validity of Anglican Orders was raised before Pope Leo XIII, in the interest of a reunion of the Church of England with Rome. There was a division of opinion in Rome on the subject, and many eminent scholars were in favour of the recognition of Anglican Orders, and the drift of opinion was at first strongly in that direction. The Pope appointed an able commission representing both sides of the question. The whole matter was carefully considered and at length decided by the Pope, on the basis of the report of the commission, that Anglican Orders were invalid. This decision was made known to the Roman Catholic episcopate in an Apostolic Letter.[1] The two archbishops of England published an answer[2] in which they maintain the validity of the Orders of the Church of England. The Cardinal Archbishop and bishops of the province of Westminster replied to this answer.[3] A considerable number of writings were also published on both sides of the question. I shall use the comment, I made upon these documents at the time, with such additions and changes as are now called for.

These official documents are of great importance for the present and the future relations of the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Communions. The decision of the Pope is adverse to the validity of Anglican Orders, and the Anglican archbishops maintain their validity. From this point of view it seems as if an insuperable obstacle to reunion had been reached. Yet a more careful study of these documents makes it evident that a very great advance toward reunion has been made and that a door to further opportunities is still open.

1. It is a decided gain that the Pope has narrowed the range of the discussion and concentrated it in his statement

[1] *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 1896.

[2] *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII*, 1897.

[3] *Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ*, 1898.

that "in pronouncing the decision in the Gordon case in 1704, weight was given to no other reason than the *defect of form and intention*"; and the Pope limits his re-examination of the case to these two points. Thus an immense amount of irrelevant material is swept out of the field of discussion for all future time.

2. A further gain is in the position taken by the Anglican archbishops when they say: "We acknowledge therefore, with the Pope, that laying on of hands is the matter of ordination; we acknowledge that the form is prayer or blessing appropriate to the ministry to be conferred; we acknowledge that the intention of the Church, as far as it is externally manifested, is to be ascertained, so that we may discern if it agrees with the mind of the Lord and his apostles and with the statutes of the Universal Church." This still further limits the range of difference to the questions, what constitutes valid form and intention in ordination, and whether the Anglican form and intention are so defective as to render ordination invalid.

3. The question is in part a historical question, and is to be decided on matters of fact by historical evidence. The Pope reopened the case which had been decided in 1704, reviewed the evidence with the help of twelve judges, "whose opinions in the matter were known to be divergent," who had access to "all documents bearing on this question which were known to exist in the Vatican archives"; they had authority "to search for new ones, and even to have at their disposal all acts relating to this subject which are adduced by learned men on both sides." There can be no reasonable doubt that the case was considered in a careful, calm and judicial manner. It was unanimously decided on the evidence before the court, and then after further deliberation this decision was ratified by the Pope. And yet the Pope's decision cannot be accepted by the Christian world as final. The right words in the Answer of the Anglican archbishops are those in which they challenge the evidence and demand its publication. "Therefore all those documents ought to

be made public if the matter is to be put on a fair footing for judgment." . . . "The documents are preserved in the keeping of the holy office and ought to be published if the interest of historical truth is to be consulted."

There is no reason to doubt the good will of Pope Leo XIII —his intent to give the case a careful, honest and upright consideration and to make an equitable final decision. But the Anglican Archbishops contested the accuracy of the evidence and its sufficiency. How could the Pope be certain that all his evidence was accurate and that all the evidence was before him? It is quite possible that the Anglican Archbishops might invalidate some of the evidence, and that they might present valuable counter-evidence from the archives of Great Britain if they had the opportunity. This demand for the publication of the evidence is a righteous demand. There is no valid reason why the present Pope should not comply with it. It is greatly to be desired that he should, in the interest of historical truth, and for the vindication before the world of a papal decision. Then if the evidence can be impeached, the Anglicans must do it; if they have other evidence they must adduce it. Then the Pope may be justified in reopening the case. He must do so, according to Canon Law, if a sufficient amount of new evidence is presented to materially alter the case. He would doubtless do so gladly under any such circumstances. At present the Anglican Bishops have the advantage of the discussion at this point, and they will retain this advantage until the Pope yields to their reasonable request and publishes his evidence. Then it is altogether probable that the advantage will pass over to the papal side; for it is doubtful whether any evidence of importance can be produced which has not already been duly considered by the papal courts. This statement is justified by the publication of part of the evidence in the Reply of the Roman Catholic Bishops of England and by other writers. At the same time it is plain that the entire case is not before the world, but only so much of it as advocates use to present their side of a controversy.

The historical question, after all, is simply this, whether the form of ordination in the Edwardine Ordinal was valid. As the Pope says, "the judgment of the Pontiff applies universally to all Anglican ordinations, because, although it refers to a particular case (that of Gordon) it is not based upon any reason special to that case, but upon the *defect of form*, which defect equally affects all these ordinations." The defect, according to the Roman opinion, is a defect in the Ordinal itself and not in any particular thing in the ordination of Gordon. This is sound reasoning. Unless Anglicans can show that the Edwardine Ordinal contains a valid form of ordination, they have no case.

The Pope well says:

> The words which, until recently, were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination, namely "*Receive the Holy Ghost,*" certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred order of priesthood or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power *of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord* (Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii., De Sacr. Ord., Can. 1), in that sacrifice which is no "nude commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross" (*Ibid.*, Sess. xxii., De Sacrif. Missæ, Can. 3). This form, had, indeed, afterward added to it the words, "*for the office and work of a priest,*" etc., but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form was defective and inadequate. But, even if this addition could give to the form its due significance, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal; for as the Hierarchy had become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining.

The Anglican Archbishops seek to avoid this powerful argumentation in this way; they say:

> This form then, whether contained in one sentence as in the Roman Church, or in two as in ours, is amply sufficient to create a Bishop, if the true intention be openly declared, which is done in other prayers and suffrages (which clearly refer to the office, work and ministry of a Bishop), in the examination, and other like ways.

But this argument was anticipated by the Pope when he says:

> In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside

other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all, that from them has been deliberately removed whatever set forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite.

In other words, the plea that "true intention" is expressed in other parts of the services is overcome by the contention that that intention itself is void of the essential significance of priesthood. Thus the whole question rests, according to the Anglican Archbishops, on the "true intention" of the other parts of the ordination service.

The Roman Catholic Bishops in their reply call attention to a misconception of the Anglican Archbishops:

You have failed to observe the word "*or*" in the proposition in which the Bull states what the requirements are. The proposition is disjunctive. The rite for the priesthood the Pope says "must definitely express the sacred Order of the priesthood *or* its grace and power, which is chiefly the power of consecrating and offering the true Body and Blood of our Lord" . . . What Leo XIII means is that the Order to which the candidate is being promoted must be distinctly indicated *either* by its accepted name *or* by an explicit reference to the grace and power which belong to it:—for the true historical fact, a fact which was carefully investigated in the recent commissions, is that not one single Ordination rite which the Catholic Church has accepted is without one or other of these alternative modes of definite signification.

It is not simply a question whether the Ordinal intends to ordain church officers with the names priests and bishops, but whether it intends to ordain a real sacrificing priesthood.

(4) The essential question in debate is thus evidently that of *intention.* Here, again, we need not go further than the Edwardine Ordinal. As the Pope says:

The history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church, as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects, and as to the end they had in view. Being fully aware of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between *the law of believing and the law of praying,* under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted in many ways the liturgical order to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason in the whole Ordinal, not only is there no clear mention of the Sacrifice, of consecration to the priesthood and

of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifices, but, as we have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. In this way the native character, or spirit, as it is called, of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself. Hence, if vitiated in its origin, it was wholly insufficient to confer Orders.

How do the Anglicans meet this strong argument? It would have been their glory if they had said, Yes, it is true the Anglican Church took part in the Reformation. It became thereby a National Reformed Church. It removed all Roman errors from the Liturgy. It was not the intention of the Reformers to ordain priests to offer sacrifices in the Roman Catholic sense. But instead of this, the Anglican Archbishops try to maintain the validity of the intention of the Ordinal. They urge that the intent of the Edwardine Ordinal was to ordain priests to offer sacrifices.

We confidently assert that our Ordinal, particularly in this last point, is superior to the Roman Pontifical in various ways, inasmuch as it expresses more clearly and faithfully those things which, by Christ's institution, belong to the nature of priesthood and the effect of the Catholic rites used in the Universal Church. . . . For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.

This, then, is the priesthood and sacrifice which the Anglican Archbishops find in the intention of the Edwardine Ordinal.

(*a*) The first thing to be considered is whether the Anglican Archbishops have correctly interpreted the intention of the Edwardine Ordinal. This is a historical question, which can only be determined by the Ordinal itself, in the circumstances of its composition and use, and in the opinions of its authors and users. The Anglican Archbishops are not

competent witnesses for the reign of Edward VI; they must present historical evidence from that reign. They do not, in their Answer, overcome the Pope's statements as to the "animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church," and the deliberate removal from the prayers of the Catholic rite, which they retained, of every trace "of the sacrifice, of consecration to the priesthood and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifices." The Archbishops are weak in their Answer at this essential point. It is of great importance that it should be made very clear by indisputable evidence whether the Edwardine Ordinal was intended to ordain priests to offer sacrifices, and if so, in what sense of priest and sacrifice.

(*b*) The Archbishops wisely say:

> Too precise definitions of the manner of the sacrifice, or of the relation which unites the sacrifice of the eternal Priest and the sacrifice of the Church, which in some way certainly are one, ought in our opinion to be avoided rather than pressed into prominence.

All who have at heart the Reunion of Christendom must sympathise with these words. At the same time, it is necessary that there should be a definition of priesthood and of sacrifice, which shall be at once historic and intelligible. If we recognise that priest and sacrifice may be used in various significations, we should seek a definition sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all these legitimate significations. That is the pathway to Reunion. The first question which emerges here is whether the terms priest and sacrifice are used by the Anglican Archbishops in their Answer in a legitimate sense. It is not sufficient to show that the sense given to these terms by the Archbishops is well known in the Church of England at this time, or that it has been a common Anglican opinion since the Reformation; no sense of priest or sacrifice can be legitimate which does not rest upon Biblical and Catholic usage. This is recognised by the Archbishops, as we understand them. They assert that "our Ordinal, particularly in this last point, is superior to

the Roman Pontifical in various ways, inasmuch as it expresses more clearly and faithfully those things which by Christ's institution belong to the nature of the priesthood and the effect of the Catholic rites used in the Universal Church." But it was not sufficient for the Archbishops to "confidently assert" this. They were called upon to prove it by indubitable evidence; for it is not evident in itself, and has not been recognised as yet by Roman Catholics, or indeed, so far as we know, by any but Anglicans, and not even by all Anglicans. The Roman Catholic Bishops in their reply devote great attention to this question. They give ample quotations from Archbishop Cranmer, who had the chief hand in composing the Ordinal, and from his associates, which show very plainly that it was their intention to exclude the Roman Catholic doctrine of priesthood and sacrifice; also from a long list of Anglican divines to the effect that Cranmer's "metaphorical use of the term sacrifice" and "of the term priesthood" has always been the official intent of the Anglican Ordinal and that therefore no real priesthood with power to offer real sacrifice ever was given in the Anglican Ordinal.

(*c*) If, now, it is granted that the Archbishops are correct in their interpretation of the intent of the Edwardine Ordinal, and that the Anglican Ordinal is more faithful to the Biblical and Catholic conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice than the Roman Pontifical, there would still remain the question whether it is possible to reconcile the Roman conception of priesthood and sacrifice with the Anglican. This, after all, is the greatest question for the Pope and for the Anglican Bishops. The Roman doctrine is definite. It is open to the objection that it is "too precise." It has, however, this advantage in the question under consideration, that it was the doctrine of the Church of England before the Reformation, and it was deliberately rejected by the Church of England at the Reformation, and another doctrine—less precise and less definite—was eventually substituted for it. There can be no doubt that a serious change was made in the intention of the Church of England in the matter of ordination. It

was a deliberate rejection of the pre-Reformation intention, and it was the substitution of a new intention, which may have been truer to the intention of the original institution and of the Ancient Catholic Church, but which certainly was not the intention of the Church of England for centuries before the Reformation. The Pope makes a great deal of this. The Anglican Archbishops slip easily over it. It is not difficult for the Anglicans to recognise the intention of the Roman ordination as valid, for the reason that there can be no doubt whatever as to the form and intent of the ordination. It is "too precise," but it includes all that the Anglicans regard as essential. It is very different with the Roman Catholics. The Edwardine Ordinal had no intention of ordaining priests to offer the sacrifice of the Mass, but the Anglicans at the time deliberately rejected all that Roman Catholics regard as essential to priesthood and sacrifice.

The Anglican reformers intended to reform the Church, and they did reform the Ordinal and the Order of the Holy Communion by removing from the pre-Reformation forms all things that they regarded as contrary to the mind of Christ and his apostles and the uses of the primitive Church. They substituted for the Roman Catholic doctrine of sacrifice and priesthood what they supposed was the Biblical doctrine. They retained sacrificial and priestly terminology with these supposed Biblical meanings, and they certainly intended to ordain a priesthood to celebrate the Holy Communion with the use of Christ's own words of institution and the elements ordained by him, and to omit nothing from the priesthood and the sacrifice that was warranted by Holy Scripture. They also raised to the chief function of the Christian ministry that which is chief in the Apostolic Commissions of our Lord, namely, the prophetic function, which had been neglected in the pre-Reformation Church. This is expressed, as the Archbishops say, by "the delivery of the Holy Bible, which is, in our opinion, the chief instrument of the sacred ministry and includes in itself all its other powers according to the particular Order to which the man is ordained."

And they did not omit the priestly function which they expressed in terms of Holy Scripture: "And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the word of God and of His Holy Sacraments" (St. Luke xii. 42; I Cor. iv. 1). As dispensers of the Holy Sacraments was evidently intended administrators of Baptism and the Holy Communion; and in the latter the use of the very words of Jesus upon which the whole doctrine of the priesthood rests, according to the Papal decision, namely, "Do this in memory (or commemoration) of me," which is used in the Anglican ceremony of ordination itself, in connection with the celebration of the sacrament of the Eucharist. Surely the words of our Lord himself are more effective of grace than any interpretation or paraphrase of these words whether in the Roman Ordinal or any other.

By this larger view of the Christian ministry, the depression of the priesthood from being the one essential thing and the elevation of prophecy to its Biblical importance, the Anglican Ordinal is much more in accord with the Holy Scripture and primitive usage than the Roman; and therefore the Anglican ministry is nearer to the mind of Jesus and his apostles than the Papal intention.

(*d*) A still higher question remains, and that is of vast importance for the whole Christian world—namely, whether it may not be possible to comprehend the Roman conception of priesthood and sacrifice with the Anglican conception, and all other conceptions, in some more comprehensive conception. Such a comprehensive conception has not yet been conceived, but it is possible that the time may come, in a new Reformation of the Church, when it may be conceived and commonly accepted as the solution of all the great problems which centre about that most essential institution of our holy religion, the Holy Communion in the Body and Blood of our Lord. It is a distinct gain that the attention of the world is again called to this supreme question, and that the question of sacrifice is made the central one in connection with the Reunion of Christendom. Theologians of all Christian communions should give it more profound

consideration with mutual charity and Christian love, seeking to contribute to that solution of all our difficulties which in the order of Providence, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, will at last be made. The Pope must recede from the too great precision in the definition of priesthood and sacrifice, as the Anglican Archbishops rightly contend, for such precision undermines and destroys the validity of the primitive ministry of the Church, the Roman no less than others.

(5) This question in debate between the Pope and the Anglican Archbishops is of interest to all Christian communions. Many Anglicans have been too arrogant in their claims as to the validity and superiority of their ordination over other Protestant communions. They will doubtless continue to set a high value upon their ordination. But they have received another and a very wholesome lesson, that in the eyes of all the rest of the Christian world, the ordination of the Church of England is of no more validity than that of the other national Churches of the Reformation. The other national Churches base their ecclesiastical right upon an appeal from the Pope to Jesus Christ. The Anglican reformers agreed with the other Reformers in this particular. It would be wholesome if the Church of England would return to the principles of its own Reformers. Protestant orders all rest firmly on the ground of the right of reformation and revolution. History justifies that right. When the time of the greater Reformation comes, the Roman Church will recognise the right of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and then, and then only, will the mutual recognition of orders take place in a reunited and reconstructed Christianity.

It was my privilege to spend a winter in Rome soon after these documents of the Pope and the Anglican Archbishops were published. I found that there were still able Roman Catholic scholars who were not convinced by the Papal decision. An eminent archbishop said to me that whether the Anglican Ordinal intended to ordain priests to offer

sacrifices or not, the intention certainly was to ordain a Christian priesthood, such as they supposed Christ and his apostles proposed. This is a sound position which the Anglican Archbishops should have made much of. A member of the Papal commission gave me the privately printed *Brevis Conspectus Ritualium Ordinationum in Oriente et Occidente adhibitorum quoad formam consecratoriam cum manuum impositione conjunctam.* This gives eight different ordinals, the Roman, the Gallican, the Greek, the Maronite, the Alexandrian Jacobite, the Armenian, the Nestorian, that of the Apostolic Constitutions and of the Syrian Jacobites. These all designate the office to which the candidate was ordained. I said to this theologian at the time, "Suppose a more ancient Ordinal should be discovered, omitting mention of office, what could you say?" He was confident that such a discovery would not be made. And yet the Ordinal of Sarapion was discovered and published by Wobbermin and then by Wordsworth in 1899, having just this omission, the significance of which has been well discussed by the Bishop of Salisbury.

There have been not a few Roman Catholics who have urged that this decision of the Pope as to Anglican Orders must be regarded as final and infallible. But Pope Pius X assured me in a private interview that this decision of his predecessor as to Anglican Orders cannot be brought under the category of infallible decisions. The Pope is certainly correct, and he is sustained by the best Roman Catholic canonists, and by the definition of Infallibility of the Vatican decree, which covers only doctrines of faith and morals and not questions of government and discipline.

The decision of Pope Leo XIII as to the validity of the Anglican Orders has lifted the whole question of orders into a better position for further investigation. The essence of the question was whether the Anglican Reformers in their Ordinal had the intention of ordaining a real priesthood to offer real sacrifices. The decision that such was not their

intention seems one that all should recognise as final. But the question still remains whether such an intention is essential to a valid Christian ministry; and so the question becomes one of doctrine—namely, what are the essential qualifications of the Christian ministry.

There are several important functions of the holy ministry. The Sarum Ordinal, on which the Anglican Ordinal is based, mentions as the functions of a priest "Offerre, benedicere, præesse, prædicare, conficere et baptizare"; but no one contends that it is necessary to mention all these in the ceremony of ordination. The practical question is whether the omission of the sacrificial function from the intention of the Ordinal invalidates it. That question must be answered in the negative. The ancient Ordinal of Sarapion makes just this omission, and it has not yet been shown that a presbyter cannot be a presbyter unless he be a sacrificing priest.

Furthermore, while it is true that the Anglican Reformers removed from the Sarum Ordinal what they supposed was the Roman conception of priesthood, and did not substitute for it the ancient Catholic conception, there is no evidence that they designed to exclude the latter. They were in a position in which such discrimination was impracticable. In their retention of so much of the ancient formula as they did, in their work of reform, they showed the intention to perpetuate the pre-Reformation ministry in all that they regarded as essential to it. Their intention was certainly to ordain and perpetuate the ministry which Jesus Christ instituted, which his apostles ordained and which the primitive Church transmitted. Their purpose in reform was simply and alone to remove the corruptions of the Mediæval Church. If now, in the removal of corruptions, they also removed many things that were not corruptions, belonging to the genuine Christian inheritance, their intention was changed in a measure from that of the pre-Reformation Church, but only so as to do exactly what they supposed Jesus and his apostles would have them do. They intended the Master's intention, the apostles' intention, the intention of the primitive Church,

even if they were mistaken, even if one could say wofully mistaken, in the contents of their intention. If, then, they omitted from their Ordinal the mention of such an important thing as the sacrificial character of the priesthood, that does not destroy their intention to ordain a ministry with all that Jesus Christ intended it to have.

A very strong argument against the validity of Anglican Orders was made by Estcourt in 1873.[1] He gives a large number of valuable documents, and considers the whole question with great thoroughness. As the Pope's decision makes the whole case depend upon the intention of the Anglican Ordinal to ordain a real sacrificing priesthood, Estcourt carries the discussion as to the conferring of the grace of priesthood a little deeper. He says:

> After this full examination of the Anglican rite, we are driven to the conclusion, that it contains and is founded upon the Lutheran doctrine, namely, that Ordination is only a public recognition and admission of a person to an office, with prayers that he may have grace to be faithful to the duty imposed upon him, and to live in a manner consistent with the same; and thus it excludes the idea of a sacrament, or of any sacramental grace conferred therein. Hence arises the very grave doubt, whether the sacrament of Holy Order can be validly administered with such a form. (P. 233.)

Here the whole question is summed up in whether Order is a sacrament, conveying sacramental grace. It is certainly true that the Anglican Reformers agreed with the Lutheran and Reformed in excluding Order from the same class of sacraments as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and in that sense would deny that Order conveyed sacramental grace in the sense that Baptism and the Eucharist do. But it is not true that any of these Reformed Churches denied the presence and impartation of divine grace in the bestowal of Order. And they did not conceive of that grace as merely the same kind of grace that an abbot would receive with the laying on of hands, or the "admission of a person to an office with prayers that he may have grace to be faithful to the duty imposed

[1] *The Question of Anglican Orders Discussed.*

upon him." They conceived of that grace as ministerial grace for the ministry instituted by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and transmitted in valid succession by the laying on of hands.

The Edwardine Ordinal, indeed, uses one of the three chief apostolic commissions, the one given by the Gospel of John, in the very words of our Lord [1] himself. If the words of Commission of our Lord are not an effective form of grace, what can be? Thus the Anglican Archbishops in their Response to Leo XIII say:

> The form of ordering a Presbyter employed among us in 1550 and afterwards was equally appropriate. For after the end of the Eucharistic prayer, which recalls our minds to the institution of our Lord, there followed the laying on of hands by the Bishop with the assistant priests, to which is joined the "imperative" form, taken from the Pontifical, but at the same time fuller and more solemn. For after the words "Receive the Holy Ghost" there immediately followed, as in the modern Pontifical (though the Pope strangely omits to mention it), "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," and then the words from the Gospel (St. Luke xii. 42) and St. Paul (I Cor. iv. 1), which were very rightfully added by our fathers, "and be thou a faithful Dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This form is suitable to no other ministry of the Church but that of a priest, who has what is called the power of the keys, and who alone with full right dispenses the word and mysteries of God to the people, whether he remain a Presbyter or be advanced to higher duties as Bishop. (P. 27.)

This is the best word in the Archbishops' Response, and they should have made more of it. The use of one of the principal apostolic commissions of our Lord in the ordaining of a priest should be regarded as a valid and effective form. Did not the author of the Gospel of John so regard it? If this is not an apostolic commission, where else will we get it in the Gospel of John? This commission mentions no office, and the Edwardine Ordinal simply follows it in this respect. If the Edwardine Ordinal is defective in this re-

[1] John xx. 22–23.

gard, so were the words of our Lord. If the words of Jesus imply the office of priesthood, then the Ordinal when it uses them implies just the same, and they are just as effective for the successors of the apostles as they were for the apostles themselves.

The Roman Catholic Bishops of England, in their *Vindication*, endeavour to meet this issue, but in vain. They venture to say:

> "And it has been claimed that these further addresses to the candidates furnish the necessary determination of the meaning, and should have been taken into account by the Bull. But to remit sins is not to offer sacrifice, nor, although the sacrifice is intimately connected with one of the sacraments, do the words, "*Be thou a faithful dispenser . . . of His holy Sacraments*," draw special attention to that particular sacrament, still less bring into prominence its sacrificial aspect. Nor does it avail to say that the Lord used these words to confer the priesthood, and that therefore they must have been sufficient for the purpose. For it is not true that our Lord conferred the priesthood by the use of these words. He had conferred the priesthood on His apostles at His Last Supper by the words: "*Do this in remembrance of me*" (*cf.* Council of Trent, Sess. xxii, cap. ix., can. 2). What he did on Easter evening by the words "*whose sins you shall forgive*" was to annex to the priesthood the supplementary power of forgiving sins, or possibly only to indicate that it had been annexed already. (P. 36.)

This argumentation is nothing less than a perversion of Holy Scripture, which does not justify the opinion that Jesus conferred the priesthood at the Lord's Supper, and that the other commissions of the apostles reported in the Gospels are supplementary thereto. These other commissions are much better sustained by Biblical criticism than the words upon which the priestly commission is supposed to be based. All of the evangelists agree in a commission given by our Lord to his apostles after his resurrection, before his final departure from them.[1] These vary in their terms, but agree in substance. And these must be regarded, from a Biblical point of view, as the real, essential and final commission.

[1] Matt. xxviii. 16–20; Mk. xvi. 14–20; Lk. xxiv. 44–53; John xx. 19–23.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper is reported by only three of the evangelists, and these make no mention whatever of the words, "Do this in remembrance of me"; and the later text of Luke, which gives it, was derived from St. Paul. It is impossible, therefore, to suppose that the Gospels understood that to be the Apostolic Commission. What they understood to be the Apostolic Commission they give, all four of them, among the last words of Jesus to his apostles.

It may also be said that St. Paul himself was commissioned by our Lord in Christophanies as the great apostle to the Gentiles. We have several reports of his commission in Acts;[1] and in the Pauline Epistles,[2] upon which St. Paul bases his apostleship,[3] and in not one of them is there the slightest hint of the performance of priestly acts; but there is the same emphasis upon a prophetic ministry as in the apostolic commissions. And yet St. Paul was certainly a priest as well as a prophet, and upon his statement[4] rests the whole fabric of the Papal opinion, that the essential ministerial function is the offering of the real sacrifice of the Eucharist, without which there is no valid ministry.

The Roman Catholic tradition singles out one of the apostolic commissions, and that one only incidental to the institution of the Eucharist, and the one not contained in the original report of the institution of the Eucharist given by the Synoptic Gospels, but given only in St. Paul's report, and one, not so much a commission to the apostles, as a command to do the one thing, celebrate the Eucharist. It singles out one thing, and makes that so essential to the Christian ministry that without it there can be no ministry at all.

There is no warrant in Holy Scripture, or in primitive Tradition, for such an exaggeration of priesthood in connection with the sacred Eucharist above all other functions of the Christian ministry, and other priestly acts; and there-

[1] Acts ix. 3–18; xxii. 6–21; xxvi. 12–18.
[2] Gal. i. 5–17; I Cor. ix. 1; II Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11–12.
[3] *Cf. Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 70 *seq.*
[4] I Cor. xi.

fore the Pope's test of the validity of Anglican Orders is no valid test. The Anglican Ordinal ordains priests with the use of one of Christ's own commissions, and supplements it with words which in Biblical usage imply priestly and prophetic functions; and that is a sufficient and effective form, implying all that Christ would have his priests to be.

IV. THE VALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS

The Reformation of the Church in the several countries of Northern Europe resulted in the organisation of national Churches. This was inevitable because the jurisdiction of the Pope, who refused the reformation demanded, could no longer be recognised without betrayal of the cause of reform. The Church of England was able to become a reformed national Church, with her bishops at her head, because the Crown was sustained by an able primate and reforming bishops. This was not the case on the Continent of Europe, where few of the bishops took part in the Reformation, and these for political reasons were deprived of their jurisdiction by the enemies of the Reformation. It was more the difference of circumstances, than the deliberate opinion and intention of the Reformers, that resulted in Episcopacy in England and Presbyterianism in various forms on the Continent. And so Episcopal ordination continued in England, but became practically impossible on the Continent, where Presbyterial ordination became necessary. The Anglican episcopal succession depends on a very slender thread. Not one of the four bishops who consecrated Archbishop Parker had jurisdiction in any of the historic sees. They received their jurisdiction from the Crown. Queen Mary died in 1558, only forty-two years of age. Her sister lived to her seventieth year. If Mary had lived twelve years longer, only one of Parker's consecrators would have been living, and in all human probability it would have been quite impossible to secure a sufficient number of bishops to consecrate a bishop independent of Rome. If England

had been called upon to choose between a Reformation without bishops or bishops without Reformation, can we think she would have chosen the latter?

The situation on the Continent was somewhat different. Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne and Elector of the Empire, a man of greater eminence and nobler Christian character than the Archbishop of Canterbury, began the reform of his diocese in 1536. In 1542–3, with the aid of Bucer and Melancthon, representing the two sides of the Reformation on the Continent, the Lutheran and the Reformed, he became a champion of the Reformation and was followed by the Bishop of Munster and others. But the German Emperor, by force of arms, deprived him of his electorate and archbishopric and destroyed the Reformation in his Electorate. If Maurice of Saxony had thought more of his religion and less of his personal animosities, and had led the Protestants against the Emperor at this time, instead of five years later, the Archbishop of Cologne would in all probability have been the great leader and mediator of the Reformation on the Continent.

It was, indeed, the providential interference of God in cutting short the life of Queen Mary, and postponing the Protestant rally about Duke Maurice, and not the deliberate choice of the Reformers, that made the Church of England Episcopal and the Churches of the Continent non-Episcopal. The situation might have been the very reverse.

Under these circumstances it is altogether unhistorical and unbecoming for the Anglicans to exalt themselves above their Protestant brethren on the Continent, as if they alone had the true Apostolic Ministry. It was due to the short life of Queen Mary and the long life of Queen Elizabeth that England was saved from the religious wars that for a generation devastated the Continent, and out of which the Protestant Churches emerged in feebleness and poverty to do the best they could under the circumstances.

Presbyterian Orders were accepted as valid by the Anglican Reformers. Bucer and Peter Martyr were received from

the Continent and made professors of theology at Oxford and Cambridge, and no one thought of questioning their Orders. All through the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century there was good-fellowship between the Anglicans and the Protestants of the Continent, even though the Puritans during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I were ever striving to make the Church of England more conformable to the Churches of the Continent in her ministry and her ceremonies. The Puritans were Presbyterians in their doctrine of church government, and they strove to put their doctrines into practice. They succeeded in Scotland under the leadership of Knox, but they failed in England. And yet neither in Scotland nor in England nor in Ireland did either party think of dividing the Church because of these differences. It was a conflict between a reforming and a conservative party in the same Church.

It was the well-nigh universal opinion of the leading divines of the Church of England in the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries that Presbyterian Orders were valid, even in the very time of conflict between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in England, Scotland and Ireland. Thus Hooker, the chief Anglican authority on the Church, over against Cartwright, the contemporary Puritan authority, says in 1593:

> There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reasons to allow ordination made without a bishop. The whole Church visible, being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain; how be it, as the ordinary cause is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways.
>
> Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have, possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes and may give place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII, 14.)

Richard Field, in 1606, in his great work, *Of the Church, Four Books*—in two different passages makes an able and

thorough defence of Presbyterian Orders. In 1610 the fifth book was published with appendix defending former books giving a third statement to the same effect. The whole was published again in 1628, and reprinted for the *Ecclesiastical Historical Society*, 1847–1853. It will be sufficient to quote the following:

For if the power of order and authority to intermeddle in things pertaining to God's service he the same in all preshyters, and that they he limited in the execution of it only for Orders' sake, so that in case of necessity every one of them may haptize, and confirm them whom they have baptized, ahsolve and reconcile penitents, and do all those other acts which regularly are appropriated unto the hishop alone; there is no reason to he given, hut that in case of necessity, wherein all hishops were extinguished hy death, or being fallen into heresy, should refuse to ordain any to serve God in His true worship, hut that preshyters, as they may do all other acts, whatsoever special challenge, bishops in ordinary course make upon them, might do this also. Who then dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by preshyters, in sundry Churches of the world, at such times as hishops, in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the truth of God, and persecuted such as professed it? Surely the hest learned in the Church of Rome in former times durst not pronounce all ordinations of this nature to he void. For not only Armachanus (*Lib.* xi. 9. *Armenorum, cap.* 7), a very learned and worthy bishop, but as it appeareth hy Alexander of Hales, many learned men in his time and before were of opinion that in some cases, and in some times, preshyters may give Orders, and that their ordinations are of force, though to do so—not heing urged hy extreme necessity—cannot he excused from over great boldness and presumption. Neither should it seem so strange to our adversaries, that the power of ordination should at some times he yielded unto presbyters, seeing their chorepiscopi, suffragans and titular hishops, that live in the diocese and churches of other hishops, and are no hishops, according to the old course of discipline, do daily, in the Romish Church, hoth confirm children and give Orders. (Bk. III., chap. xxxix.)

Francis Mason wrote a treatise upon *The Validity of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, Maintained against the Romanists*, as an appendix to his work: *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*. The work itself was published after his death by desire of Archbishop Abbot

in 1625, and again in 1638. But this vindication of Presbyterian Orders was not published until 1641, when it was issued with a brief declaration of the several forms of government of the Continental Protestant Churches, by John Dury, the great peacemaker of the age. In this thorough vindication of Presbyterian Orders, at the conclusion, Mason says:

> Wherefore seeing a bishop and a presbyter do not differ in order, but only in pre-eminence and jurisdiction, as yourselves [the Roman Catholics] acknowledge; and seeing Calvin and Beza had the order of priesthood, which is the highest order in the Church of God, and were lawfully chosen, the one after the other, to a place of eminency and endued with jurisdiction, derived unto them from the whole Church wherein they lived; you cannot with reason deny them the substance of the Episcopal office. And whereinsoever their discipline is defective, we wish them, even in the bowels of Christ Jesus, by all possible means to redress and reform it; and to conform themselves to the ancient custom of the Church of Christ, which hath continued from the apostles' time; that so they may remove all opinion of singularity and stop the mouth of malice itself. Thus much concerning the ministers of other reformed Churches; wherein if you will not believe us, disputing for the lawfulness of their calling; yet you must give us leave to believe God, Himself from heaven approving their ministry by pouring down a blessing upon their labours.

The authenticity of this volume was challenged by John Lindsay in the introduction to his edition of the *Vindicæ* in 1734, but on insufficient grounds. The only reasons he has to give are, that it was not published with the work itself in 1625, and that it does not agree with Mason's opinions. But in this latter he is altogether mistaken, for he identifies Mason's opinions with his own, and so misinterprets him. Indeed, the authenticity might rather be questioned if Mason agreed with Lindsay; for Hooker, Field and the citation given from Mason are in entire accord, and these represent the common Anglican opinion of the first half of the seventeenth century; whereas Lindsay represents the common Anglican opinion after the Restoration in 1662.

In 1610 the validity of Presbyterian Orders was put to the test. Three Scottish bishops were consecrated by three

Anglican bishops under the authority of the Crown, and the primate of England, without requiring them to be ordained as priests, they having received Presbyterian ordination only.

King James was the head of the Church of England by the action of Parliament and Convocation in the reign of Henry VIII. He now assumed the same relation to the Church of Scotland, and by gradual and persistent pressure compelled the Presbyterian Church of Scotland to engraft bishops as permanent moderators with superior jurisdiction over presbyteries and provincial synods. By his royal commission he required the Bishops of Ely, Bath and Wells, and Rochester to consecrate the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Brechin and Galloway. Previous to the consecration, the whole situation was carefully considered by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of his province. Spottiswoode, the Archbishop of Glasgow, then consecrated, who was subsequently transferred to St. Andrews and became the primate of Scotland, tells us of this discussion. This is testimony of the highest value by a man present at the time, who was himself consecrated by these English bishops, and who thoroughly understood the state of opinion in England and Scotland, and who as an ecclesiastic of the highest rank and ability could not have made a mistake in this all-important situation. This is what Spottiswoode tells us:

> A question in the meantime was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, "must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop." The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained "that thereof was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise, that it might be doubted if there were any valid vocation in most of the reformed Churches." This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day and place appointed the three Scottish bishops were consecrated. (*History of the Church of Scotland*, Bk. vii.)

These words of Archbishop Bancroft express the common opinion of his time among the Anglican divines, as we know

from the writings of Hooker, Richard Field, Mason, his contemporaries, and Joseph Hall and other Anglicans a little later, before the civil wars divided the Christians of Great Britain into so many warring factions. They also suit the situation in Scotland, for these Scottish bishops after their consecration recognised the Presbyterian Orders of their presbyters and in no instance did they venture upon giving Episcopal ordination to those who had been ordained as they themselves had been by presbyters only. There should be no doubt, therefore, that in the consecration of three bishops for Scotland by three English bishops acting under the authority of the Crown and the Primate of All England, the Church of England committed itself to the recognition of the validity of Presbyterian Orders and only attempted to add Episcopacy to Presbyterianism so far as Scotland was concerned.

There is, however, another interpretation of this consecration which has come down as a tradition in a large number of Anglican writers which is altogether inconsistent with the statement of Spottiswoode. These statements may be traced back to Heylyn, whose *Ærius Redivivus,* or *History of the Presbyterians,* was published in 1670, shortly after his death. Heylyn was chaplain to both Charles I and Charles II, and a violent adherent of Archbishop Laud and his policy, and a fierce and unscrupulous polemic divine. He gives an account of the circumstances leading up to the consecration of the Scottish bishops and then goes on to say:

> The character was only necessary to complete the work, which could not be imprinted but by consecration according to the rules and canons of the primitive times. And that this character might be indelibly imprinted by them, His Majesty issued a commission under the Great Seal of England to the bishops of London, Ely, Wells and Rochester, whereby they were required to proceed with the consecration of the said three bishops, according to the rules of the English ordination, which was by them performed with all due solemnity in the chapel of the Bishop of London's house, near the church of St. Paul, October 21st, 1610. But first a scruple had been moved by the Bishop of Ely concerning the capacity of the persons nominated for receiving the Epis-

copal consecration, in regard that none of them had formerly been ordained priests; which scruple was removed by Archbishop Bancroft, alleging that there was no such necessity of receiving the orders of priesthood, but that Episcopal consecration might be given without it, as might be exemplified in the cases of Ambrose and Nectarius, of which the first was made Archbishop of Milan and the other Patriarch of Constantinople, without receiving any intermediate Orders, whether of priest, deacon, or any other (if there were any other), at that time in the Church. (*Lib.* xi, p. 382.)

The Anglican tradition since Heylyn builds upon him exclusively so far as I have been able to determine. Thomas Frere[1] refers to Collier[2] as his authority, and Collier refers to Heylyn. Hook[3] makes the same statement without giving his authority. Perry[4] refers to Spottiswoode, Heylyn and Collier, but follows the latter. It is, indeed, astonishing that so many able historians should neglect the testimony of Spottiswoode and follow Heylyn. The explanation is probably that Heylyn's interpretation seemed to them the only reasonable one, because they were themselves all involved in the opinion of the school of Laud, that the Presbyterian Orders of Scotland could not be regarded as valid, and therefore it was impossible that they ever could have been so regarded by English bishops. But in this opinion they entirely ignore the opinions of the greatest Anglican authorities of the first half of the seventeenth century. No one who knows the character, ability and standing of the two men, Spottiswoode and Heylyn, could help giving the palm to the former in the case of conflicting testimony, especially as Spottiswoode knew of his own knowledge the facts of the case, whereas Heylyn could only have known about them by hearsay or written testimony. He mentions no authority whatever. We can only think, therefore, that he is giving a hearsay tradition without attempting to verify it; and his testimony is also vitiated by the fact that it is so closely attached to his

[1] *History of the English Church in the Reign of Elizabeth and James I.*
[2] *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.*
[3] *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.*
[4] *History of the Church of England.*

theory that the consecration of a bishop imprints an indelible character.

I do not mean to intimate that Heylyn deliberately changed the story to suit his theory. He probably, in his usual careless manner, put into Archbishop Bancroft's mouth words used by another, and omitted the real words that the Archbishop said because they seemed to him improbable. We might reasonably have made this conjecture on the principles of Historical Criticism, as the only way in which to save the veracity of the man at the expense of his accuracy. But indeed we have evidence that such was really the case. Neale, the careful and usually accurate historian of the Puritans, says:

> Andrews, Bishop of Ely, was of opinion that before their consecration they ought to be made priests, because they had not been ordained by a bishop. This the Scots divines were unwilling to admit, through fear of the consequence among their own countrymen; for what must they conclude concerning the ministers of Scotland if their own ordination as presbyters was not valid? Bancroft therefore yielded, that where bishops could not be had, ordination by presbyters must be valid, otherwise the character of the ministers in most of the reformed Churches might be questioned. Abbot, Bishop of London, and others were of opinion that there was no necessity of passing through the inferior orders of deacon and priest, but that the episcopal character might be conveyed at once, as appears from the examples of St. Ambrose, Nectarius, Eucherius, and others, who from mere laymen were advanced at once into the episcopal chair.

This on the face of it seems to explain the discrepancy between Spottiswoode and Heylyn. Spottiswoode gives the words of the Archbishop because they were the only important ones and the only ones which, in his opinion, had anything to do with the consecration. Heylyn gives the words of the Bishop of London, which in some way by a tradition which had come to him were transferred to the Archbishop, the words of the Archbishop himself having been forgotten.

This theory of Abbot, the Bishop of London, that a layman might be made a bishop *per saltum*, and receive by such

consecration all the ministerial orders with their functions together with episcopal jurisdiction, seems an easier way of avoiding the recognition of the validity of Presbyterian ordination than it really is. As Neale says:

> But whether this supposition does not rather weaken the arguments for bishops being a distinct order from presbyters, I leave with the reader.

The great Anglican authority on the Church, Richard Field, in 1606, says that

> all the best learned among the Romanists agree in this that a bishop ordained *per saltum*, that never had the ordination of a presbyter, can neither consecrate and administer the sacrament of the Lord's body, nor ordain a presbyter, himself being none, nor do any act peculiarly pertaining to presbyters.

If Field and these Roman canonists are correct and these three Scottish bishops were consecrated *per saltum*, as so many Anglican writers, following Heylyn, suppose, then their consecration by the other Scottish bishops was invalid, and their ordination of all priests of the Scottish Church was also invalid, and the ministry of the Episcopal Church of Scotland were put in a far worse position than were those of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. We do not know what position the Lambeth Conference of 1908 really meant to take, but they say:

> In so far as these precedents involve consecration to the episcopate *per saltum*, the conditions of such consecration would require careful investigation and statement.

This looks as if they were doubtful, to say the least, that there had been any such ordination *per saltum* in 1610. I can hardly think that such an eminent scholar as the Bishop of Salisbury, who so distinctly in his writings recognises the validity of Presbyterian Orders, and who is the best-informed scholar, on the matter of the history of Orders, in Great Britain, could give any such interpretation to the consecration of 1610.

In fact, according to the consensus of the ancient canonists,

episcopal consecration is not strictly an ordination at all. It bestows order only in the sense of regimen or jurisdiction, not in the sense of ministerial character, which is imparted in the ordination to the priesthood, and cannot be imparted in consecration to the episcopate.

These words probably mean to be a caution to the explanation of the consecration of 1610 common in the Anglican historians, a caution which they should take to heart lest they be caught, as Neale and Field suggest, in their own trap. They certainly will fare much better, both as historians and churchmen, if they abandon this false conception of consecration *per saltum* and frankly admit the historical fact that the Church of England did, in 1610, by the consecration of these presbyterially ordained Scotch presbyters as bishops, in fact recognise the validity of Presbyterian Orders, as did all the contemporary Anglican authorities. If that consecration is to be a real precedent they will follow it in that respect, and so open the door to the reunion of British Christianity.

The tradition in the Church of England, that the Scottish bishops were consecrated *per saltum*, involves a great peril to the validity of the consecration, for it would be against the Canon Law of the Church. It is quite true that in the early Church, bishops were ordained *per saltum*, but that was before the difference between presbyter and bishop had become accentuated, and before Order had taken its place among the sacraments. In these early ordinations, the ordination was really to the priesthood, for there was no special ceremony of consecration for the bishop. But when the consecration of the bishop had become fixed in usage as a separate ceremony, the ordination of a bishop *per saltum* was prohibited, for it was no longer an ordination, properly so called, bestowing Order, but a consecration to a higher jurisdiction. The Roman canonists are in general accord on this question, and they sustain the position taken by Richard Field in 1606.

So far as the seven orders are concerned there may be an ordination *per saltum*, that is, the ordination to the higher order

involves all the lower orders. But this is not the case with the consecration to the episcopate. As Thomas Aquinas says:

> Sed episcopalis potest dependet a sacerdotali; qui nullus potest recipere episcopalem potestatem nisi pruis habeat sacerdotalem. Ergo episcopatus non est ordo. (*Qu.* 40 a 5.)

With this Roman Catholic canonists, dogmatic writers and historians generally agree. So the Jesuit Billot says:

> Non est similis ratio de consecratione episcopali quæ omnino nulla esset, si non pre-existeret character sacerdotalis; episcopatus enim non est ordo distinctus a sacerdotio ut jam dictum est, et infra ex professo declarabitur. (*De Ecclesiæ Sacramentis,* 1900, p. 268.)

Therefore, if the consecration of the Scottish bishops was *per saltum,* it was null and void so far as giving them priesthood is concerned, or power of confirming and ordaining.

It may be said that the English bishops reverted to the more ancient usage. If they did so, they must take the consequences and regard bishops and priests as really of one order, and abandon the Anglo-Catholic tradition of the superiority of the bishop in ministerial character.

But they were not permitted to revert to the ancient usage. If they intended to consecrate Scottish bishops *per saltum* to the priesthood as well as the episcopate, they had no authority to have such an intention, and there is no sufficient evidence that they had it. The private intention of the consecrators amounts to nothing. They acted as the servants of the Church of England under the authority of the Crown and the primate, whose opinion, as we have shown, was that Presbyterian Orders were valid. They could not act of their own sovereign authority. Their intention was the official intention of the Church of England as expressed in the Ordinal, and any other intention they might have had was altogether invalid. It is certain that the Ordinal of the Church of England had no intention of consecrating bishops *per saltum.* The Anglican consecration of a bishop does not ordain a priest. The form omits those things in the form of ordination of a priest which were intended to confer ministerial character,

and therefore cannot confer priesthood. If the ordainers of 1610 intended to ordain bishops *per saltum*, they could not possibly have done so by the use of the Anglican form for consecration of bishops. If they thought they could, and tried to do it, they utterly failed, and their action was null and void.

King James, in 1618, sent representatives of the Church of England to the Synod of Dort. They took part in the deliberations of that body, thereby recognising the Orders of the Presbyterian ministers from all sections of the Reformed Churches of the Continent.

In 1638, owing to the aggressions of Archbishop Laud and King Charles II upon the liberties of the National Church of Scotland, and the attempt to impose upon them a liturgy even more against their taste than that of the Church of England, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland deposed all the Scottish bishops because of their subserviency to the Crown and the authority of a foreign episcopate.

Bishop Joseph Hall, in his denunciation of this action of the Church of Scotland, yet at the same time recognises the validity of the Orders of the Reformed Churches of the Continent in the following intense language:

> Yea if the last bishop of Geneva had become a Protestant and consented in matters of doctrine to Calvin, Farel, Viret, have you, or any man living, just cause to think that the citie would not gladly have retained his government still and thought themselves happy under such a protection? Would they have rejected him as an enemy whom they might have enjoyed as a patron? Would they have stood upon his Episcopacie, while they had his concurrence in the truth of religion? No man that hath either brains or forehead will affirm it, since the world knows the quarrel was not at its dignitie, but at his opposition to intended Reformation. . . . Thus those learned divines and Protestants of Germany, wherein all the world sees the Apologist professeth for them, that they greatly desired to conserve the government of bishops, that they were altogether unwillingly driven from it; that it was utterly against their heart, that it should have been impaired or weakened; that it was only the personal cruelty and violence of the Romish persecutors in a bloody opposition to the doctrine of the Gospel which was then excepted against. (*Episcopacy by Divine Right*, 1640, pp. 7–12.)

We should consider the historical situation when the Churches of the Reformation were separated from Rome and compelled to become national churches.

It is true that Joseph Hall would not bring the Nonconformists of England and the Scottish Presbyterians, who deliberately deposed their bishops, under this rule. But he was blinded by the conflict in which he was engaged; and the Anglicans since his time have too often wrapped themselves in the prejudices born of the civil wars of England and the bitter ecclesiastical controversies that continued through the whole of the seventeenth century.

Bishop Hall, Archbishop Laud, and the Scottish bishops who were deprived, represented prelatical assumptions and despotisms that would not be tolerated anywhere in the Anglican world at the present time. I doubt not if the American House of Bishops were composed of such bishops, and such bishops only, the American Episcopalians would throw them off in the interests of freedom of conscience, even if they had to get on without any bishops at all. The battle of Nonconformity and of Presbytery was not so much against episcopacy as against the intolerable yoke of prelacy. Therefore, in my opinion, Hooker's principle really applies to the situation in England and Scotland as well as to that on the Continent.

At the restoration of Charles II in 1661, only one bishop, Sydserf, remained to the Church of Scotland of those deposed in 1638. In order to restore the episcopate to Scotland, the Crown selected four men to be consecrated by the English bishops. Two of these, Fairford and Hamilton, had received priests' orders under the old episcopate, and their orders were accepted by the consecrators as valid. But Sharp and Leighton had received their ordination as presbyters since 1638 by the laying on of hands of the presbytery. The Bishop of London insisted that these two must be made deacons and priests before they could be consecrated as bishops. Sharp remonstrated and pleaded the case of Archbishop Spottiswoode and those who had been consecrated

with him; but in vain, for the English bishops of 1661 would not follow the precedent of 1610. Accordingly, Sharp and Leighton were ordained deacons and priests before they were consecrated as bishops. Thus the Anglican bishops of 1661 refused to recognise the validity of the Presbyterian Orders of Scotland. The reason for this change of opinion was the result of the conflicts and civil wars that raged in Great Britain from 1641–1661.

As Burnet says:

But the late war, and the disputes during that time, had raised these controversies higher, and brought men to stricter notions, and to maintain them with more fierceness. The English Bishops did also say, that by the late Act of Uniformity that matter was more positively settled than it had been before; so that they could not legally consecrate any but those who, according to that constitution, were made first priests and deacons. They also made this difference between the present time and King James; for then the Scots were only in an imperfect state, having never had bishops among them since the Reformation; so in such a state of things, in which they had been under a real necessity, it was reasonable to allow of their Orders, how defective soever: But that of late they had been in a state of schism, had revolted from their bishops, and had thrown off that Order, so that orders given in such wilful opposition to the whole constitution of the primitive Church was a thing of another nature. They were positive in the point and would not dispense with it. Sharp stuck more at it than could have been expected from a man that had swallowed down greater matters. Leighton did not stand much upon it. He did not think orders given without bishops were null and void. He thought the forms of government were not settled by such positive laws as were unalterable; but only by apostolical practices, which, as he thought, authorized episcopacy as the best form. Yet he did not think it necessary to the being of a church. But he thought that every church might make such rules of ordination as they pleased, and that they might reordain all that came to them from any other church; and that reordaining a priest ordained in another church imparted no more, but that they received him according to their rules and did not infer the annulling the orders he had formerly received. (*History of His Own Time*, 1724, Vol. I, pp. 139–140.)

As Cunningham says:

James had attempted to engraft episcopacy upon presbytery; Charles attempted to eradicate presbytery altogether. James had in-

troduced bishops only as the permanent moderators of presbyteries. Charles now interdicted presbyteries from meeting at all, till they should be recognised as bishops' courts. (*History of the Church of Scotland.*)

This was the spirit of the Royalist Party and of the Episcopal Party in the Church. They were mad against Presbyterianism, and determined to destroy it altogether. But this inconsistency between the action of the English bishops of 1610 and of 1661 has some serious consequences. If Presbyterian Orders were invalid in 1661, were they not equally so in 1610? If they were invalid in 1610, then the Scottish bishops consecrated at that time had no power of Order, and all their ordinations were invalid. Then the Orders of Sydserf, Fairford and Hamilton were just as invalid as those of Sharp and Leighton. If that is so, then only two of the five Scottish bishops of 1661 had valid Orders, and these depended upon the right of the Anglican bishops to consecrate them, under the sole authority of the Crown, and against the wishes of the National Church of Scotland.

It is one of the revenges of history that a Scottish episcopate, restarting with such Low Churchmen as those of 1661, who did not regard their episcopal ordination as any more than a necessary ceremony, not adding any validity to their previous Presbyterian ordination, should have given birth to such high-fliers as the Non-juring bishops who, though unrecognised by the Church of England, thought they might yet give a valid episcopacy to the American people. It is not difficult to understand how these eccentric notions of the episcopate arose among the Non-jurors; but it is difficult to give them any real value in the official intention of the Scottish Ordinal or in the historic succession of the Church.

If the validity of Orders is to be tested with the same strictness as the Anglo-Catholics are wont to test Presbyterian Orders, then surely Presbyterian Orders have much stronger reasons for validity than such mixed Orders as exist in the Scottish Episcopal Church, derived partly from Presbyterian Orders and partly from a foreign Church whose right to impart either jurisdiction or functions may be questioned, ac-

cording to the Canon Law, and especially by those who hold to a special episcopal character. But we are not, in fact, justified in going so far. There were irregularities enough, both as to the Orders of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, but not sufficient in either case to impair their essential validity.

The Christian ministry depends on the Apostolic Commission given by Jesus Christ to his apostles and transmitted by them through all the successive generations of Christian ministers. The intention of Jesus Christ in his commission was the intention of his apostles when they ordained the apostolic ministry, and the same intention has been in the minds of all their successors. No one since the apostles has attained the full measure of their intention. We may be sure that even the apostles did not rise to the ideal of the Master himself. And all through the history of the Church the ordainers have varied in their conceptions of what the ministry were called upon to do; but none of the great representative Christian bodies has ever intended to ordain any other kind of a ministry than Jesus Christ and his apostles intended.

If Anglican Orders can be defended only on the ground of the intention of the Anglican Reformers to ordain and perpetuate a Christian ministry, such as Jesus Christ and his apostles intended, the Orders of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches may be defended on exactly the same grounds, from the same intention. If they omitted important items in the ordination of their ministry, they did not omit this same intention. The substance of the intention of the Anglicans and the Protestants of the Continent was the same. The only important difference was that the Anglicans retained the *episcopal* succession; the Protestants of the Continent retained only succession through the presbyters. This difference was due more to the providence of God than to the deliberate choice of the Reformers. Under these circumstances the Anglicans, if they really desire the reunion of Christ's Church, ought to follow the Anglican Reformers

and many of the great Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and recognise the Orders of other Protestants as essentially valid. If the Anglicans may enrich their doctrine of the holy ministry and also their intention in the ceremony, so may the other Protestants also. There is no serious barrier in the way except the common traditional opinion among Anglicans. The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country have never, by any official decision, pronounced Lutheran or Presbyterian Orders invalid. If Pope Leo XIII has shut the door to Rome in their face, they have not as yet shut the door to the sister Churches of the Reformation.

There are, in fact, in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, bishops and clergy whose views of the Christian ministry do not differ in any appreciable degree from those held in the various Protestant Churches. There are other bishops and clergy who do not vary in any important particular from the Roman Catholic view. If these can live in harmony in the same Church, why should they make it so hard for those, with whom they agree, or at least whom they tolerate, to unite with them? As the Bishop of Salisbury, the ablest and best Anglican authority on Christian institutions, well says:

A dispassionate study of the evidence leads us, then, to these conclusions: (1) that the three orders, as orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, existed from the time of the Apostles in certain parts of the Church, especially in Palestine, Syria and the Province of Asia; (2) that in some other parts, especially at Rome and Alexandria, there were at first only two orders, the governing order acting normally as a corporate body or College; (3) that in process of time, and more particularly in the course of the third century, this governing order tended more and more to act in the matter of ordination through its Presidents, although the right of the latter to act normally quite alone has never been regularly established except at Rome; (4) that in this way the governing order in the West has been differentiated into two degrees, though a tradition has always been kept up that they had an essential unity of character, now defined as "Priesthood" or "sacerdotium." Not only has this tradition never been condemned by the Church, but it is probably a growing belief; and it has much to recommend it as a practical basis

for that reunion between Episcopalians and Presbyterians which is one of the most obviously necessary tasks of English-speaking Christianity. (*Ministry of Grace*, 1903, p. 142.)

V. WHAT IS ORDER?

There is much confusion as regards the question of Order in the ministry, because Order is used in various senses. The Anglican Ordinal says in the Preface:

It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

Order is here used in the sense of gradation of ministerial office, not in the strict sense of the term. Thus Francis Mason says:

The canonists affirm it (the episcopate) to be an Order, the schoolmen deny it. Yet Bellarmine and Scultingius avouch there is no difference between them. Because the canonists call it an order in respect of regiment, the schoolmen deny it, as Order is a sacrament. In like manner because a bishop is sanctified and set apart with the imposition of hands to publick employment in ecclesiastical government, the Church of England, with your canonists (the Roman), call it an order; and yet many deny with your schoolmen that it is properly an order as Deaconship and Priesthood. To which you may the rather be induced because the authors of the Book having spoken first of the Ordering of Deacons and then of the Ordering of Priests, when they came to the Form of making Bishops, they never call it *Ordering* but alwaies *Consecrating*. (*The Validity of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas Maintained against the Romanists*, 1641, p. 157.)

The bishops are an order separate from presbyters in jurisdiction, not in the proper functions of the Christian ministry which are common to bishops and presbyters, as all the great scholastics teach. Thomas Aquinas says expressly, "episcopatus non est ordo."[1]

Bonaventura says:

Episcopatus prout distinguitur contra sacerdotium, non est proprie nomen ordinis, nec novus character imprimitur, nec nova potestas datur, sed potestas data ampliatur. (*Opera* V, p. 369.)

[1] IV sect., dist. 24, qu. 2, art. 2.

Michael de Medina, one of the chief authorities of the Council of Trent, says that Jerome, Augustine, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact:

Omnes colligunt ideo aut episcopos presbyteros, aut presbyteros vocari episcopos; quod una eademque res esset episcopus et presbyter, quantum ad ordinis potestatem attinet. (*De sacrorum hominum origine, lib. i, cap.* 5.)

Canisius, the great teacher of the Jesuits of the Counter-reformation, in his Catechism of world-wide use, says:

And although as touching the sacrament of Order and the authority of offering sacrifice there be no difference between bishops and priests, yet are they more excellent and higher than priests if we consider the power and authority of governing the Church, of feeding souls, of confirming the baptized and of ordering clerks.

To these authorities it is sufficient to add the chief Jesuit Professor of Scholastic Theology in Rome, Billot:

Fide catholica credendum est episcopos esse simplicibus presbyteris potestate ordinis superiores. Quotamen non obstante dicendum videtur novum characterem in consecratione episcopali non dari, sed preexistentem ampliari ad eas sacrorum collationes quæ completive ac veluti cumulative per legem Novi Testamenti Sacerdotio adscribuntur. (*De Ecclesiæ Sacramentis.* Thesis xxxi, p. 281.)

As regards the ordination of priests by bishops, it should be recognised: (1) that this ordination by a bishop is not isolated from ordination by priests, two of whom at least share in the ordination, not as spectators or witnesses as some have supposed, but as active participants in the ordination. (2) The bishop confers nothing additional to that which the priests confer except the authority lodged in his superior jurisdiction by the Law of the Church. (3) The authority to ordain may be given by the Pope or patriarch to presbyters. Therefore, ordination by presbyters alone, without a bishop, must be regarded as valid ordination, even if it be deemed irregular because contrary to Church Law and custom.

Rosellus says:

> The doctors are of opinion that the pope may commit to any clerk that he may confer those things which he himself hath: as if he be a presbyter, he may ordain a presbyter; if he be a deacon, he may make a deacon at the pope's commandment. . . . I hold that the pope may give commission to presbyters to confer all sacred orders, even minor orders, and in this I stand with the opinion of the canonists. (*De potestate Imperatoris et Papæ*, pt. iv, cap. 16.)

Morin, in his great work on Ordinations, gives a long list of canonists who hold this opinion.[1] If the Pope can give such authority to ordain to presbyters, he does it because of his superior power of jurisdiction, not because of his having any more of the character of Order to impart than a simple priest. If the Pope can do this, a patriarch may when he has the supreme jurisdiction. And so may any other supreme jurisdiction in a Church, whether it be the King of England or a German prince or a General Assembly of a Presbyterian Church or the Supreme Consistory of a Lutheran Church.

The question of the validity of Presbyterian Orders must, therefore, be answered in the affirmative from the point of view of ministerial Order. The only question really open is whether such ordinations are regular. They are not regular in Episcopal Churches except in the circumstances given above; but they are regular in Presbyterian, Lutheran, Congregational and other Churches, because the Law of those Churches justifies such ordinations.

So far as a Reunion of these other Churches with the Episcopal Churches is concerned, there is no need of any reordination for the conferring of ministerial character. If there be a reordination it is only for the purpose of making the ministry regular so far as jurisdiction is concerned.

[1] *Commentarius De Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinationibus*, Pars. iii, exerc. 4, cap. 3.

VI. ORDER AND SACRAMENT

Order is considered as one of the seven sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church and one of the seven mysteries in the Greek and Oriental Churches. Protestants do not regard it as a sacrament; yet it is generally considered a means of ministerial grace and by many as having sacramental character. The sacramental grace of Order is in the ordination of the priesthood, endowing the priest with the grace to fulfil ministerial functions of prophecy, priesthood and royalty. The consecration of a bishop is not a separate sacrament. If it have sacramental character, it is only an extension of the sacrament of priesthood, not a different sacrament from that of priesthood. All the ancient canonists hold to this, and the ablest modern Roman Catholic scholastics and canonists agree. If this be so, then the bishop has no more sacramental grace to bestow than a presbyter. The only extension of grace he has he cannot bestow, because that belongs to him as bishop.

Durandus regards the Order of the priesthood as a sacrament, the six lesser orders being *Sacramentalia.* Priesthood and episcopate are one sacrament, as the episcopate can be given only to one already priest.[1] If the consecration of a bishop does not confer any new character, but only extends and amplifies the character already bestowed on priesthood, as the Anglican archbishops seem to imply when they say, "with full right to dispense the word and mysteries of God, whether he remain a presbyter or be advanced to higher duties as bishop;"[2] then, when Anglo-Catholics insist so strongly upon the special character of bishops, they are deluding themselves with a false conception by making too great a distinction between bishop and priest; and in this respect they differ from all other authorities of all other Christian Churches throughout the world and are without

[1] In Sent. 4, dist. 24, qu. 2.
[2] *Loc. cit.*, p. 27.

support in ancient, mediæval or modern times save in a few Anglican divines.

It is evident that those who composed the Anglican Ordinal did not think that the consecration of a bishop conferred any special character or had anything of the nature of a sacrament connected with it. The Preface to the Ordinal does not claim any divine right for the episcopate, but appeals solely and alone to historic fact:

> It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

Furthermore, it does not venture to make a rule for other Christian Churches but only for the Church of England, when it says:

> And therefore to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England: it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest or Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.

It does not pronounce upon the kind of ordination required by the Reformed Churches of the Continent with whom the Church of England was in fellowship during the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries. It was not until the Revision of 1661, after the Civil Wars had embittered controversy as to Orders, that the addition was made: "or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination," with the intent of ruling out those who had received Presbyterian ordination in Great Britain. But this addition did not make any essential change in the Ordinal, or go any further than make the rule more specific with reference to the Church of England and that Church alone, except so far as daughter Churches have followed in its footsteps.

At this point the Roman Catholic criticism of Anglican Orders seems to be just. In the consecration of a bishop, these words only were used: "*Receive the Holy Ghost,*" in the original Ordinal before 1661, with the exhortation, "and

remember that thou stir up the grace which is given thee by this imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness."

There is nothing in this form which suggests any more, as Estcourt urges, than the grace implored for an abbot when in the Roman Catholic Church he is consecrated to his office. The quotation from II Tim. i. 6–7 does not in itself suggest the episcopal office except to those who put that special interpretation upon the text. And it seems clear from Cranmer, the chief composer of the Ordinal, and Barlow, the chief consecrator of Parker, and the influence of Bucer and other Reformed divines at the time, that there was not any other thought or intention than of consecrating an officer of the Church, giving him authority to exercise his office and appropriate jurisdiction. They had no intention of imprinting any special episcopal character, and there is nothing whatever in the formula itself to suggest any other intention than that of Cranmer, Barlow and their associates at the time. The change of opinion in the Church of England on the part of the Anglican episcopate and priesthood, however extensive it may have been, first from the human right of the episcopate to the divine right first expressed by Bancroft, and then to a special apostolic succession for Anglican bishops with special episcopal character imprinted in consecration which seems to be the opinion of the Laudian school, cannot change the original intent of the Ordinal upon which the Anglican episcopate is based; because that change of opinion has never been expressed in any revision of the Ordinal; and if it had been, it would be too late, for it could not restore a succession which had already lapsed if the Anglo-Catholic theory of the episcopate be correct.

But it is not correct, it is eccentric and unjustifiable. The Anglican episcopate has now what it always has had and nothing more, namely, episcopal succession so far as authority and jurisdiction are concerned, but not so far as any special episcopal character is concerned. Its priestly character, so far as it has any, it gets from priestly ordination and not

from episcopal consecration. The only way in which Anglican Orders can be successfully maintained is the same way in which the Orders of the other Protestant Churches can be maintained, namely, through presbyterial succession which alone transmits the functions of prophecy, priesthood and royalty in all the Churches of the Reformation.

If the Anglo-Catholic party take too high a view of episcopal Orders, the other Protestants often take too low a view of the sacramental character of the Christian priesthood. As I shall show elsewhere in this book,[1] the Reformers excluded Order from the sacraments because they would have no other sacred institution ranked with Baptism and the Eucharist. This led them inevitably to a depreciation of the priestly grace in ordination, especially by the successors of the Reformers. In this they made a great mistake. But they did not go so far as to do away with the sacred institution of Order. They still retained the matter and the form of Order which have always been regarded as the only essential things. They used the imposition of hands, and the institutional words of Jesus Christ, in some one of his apostolic commissions, which they regarded as effective words, real means of conveying ministerial grace. Therefore, they were correct in essentials though in error in non-essentials, and their ordinations did, in fact, convey the grace of the Christian ministry and transmit it from generation to generation in the Protestant Churches. The divine grace of Order was not limited to their personal theories or intentions, but was only measured by the intention of Jesus Christ and his apostles, whose mind they intended to perpetuate in a ministry reformed after his own heart.

The Roman Catholic opinion that reordination is sacrilegious unless conditioned is from the point of view of that sacramental character of Order which Protestants do not hold. If reordination be sacrilegious the authorities of the Church ought to be extremely careful lest they commit that sin. They should not venture to question the validity of

[1] *The Sacramental System.*

Orders merely in the interest of certain theories as to the origin of the Christian ministry, or as to its nature, which may be possible or probable, but which cannot be regarded as certain; for the Church of Christ is now and ever has been greatly divided about them; and in the present division of Churches, one Church is as eager to fulfil the intent of Jesus Christ and his apostles as the others; and none of them has the divine warrant of Holy Scripture or the consensus of primitive Christianity to sustain its discordant theories and practices.

From this point of view those who deem the repetition of Order sacrilegious cannot be so sensitive about it as they profess to be, otherwise they would not run the risks of so many sins of sacrilege as they continually commit in reordaining Christian ministers who have been ordained in other Christian Churches with the sincere intention of giving them the ministerial character which Jesus Christ and his apostles proposed, and who have attested their ministry by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of souls, the Christian nurture of their congregations and the godliness of their ministerial life.

VII. FUNCTION AND JURISDICTION

It should be recognised that there are two distinct things in ordination: the one the impartation of ministerial function, the other the authority to exercise the same; the former is transmitted by the succession of presbyters, the latter is given by the jurisdiction, whatever it be, which ordains. This distinction is clearly made in Church Law. Ordinarily it is necessary to have the appointment to a cure or some special ministerial office or there can be no ordination. In the ordination of a priest the two things, function and authority, are both given, and usually also jurisdiction. But for sufficient reasons ordination may be given without a cure and then the minister receives the functions and a sort of general authority, but has no particular jurisdiction in which to

exercise his functions. And so a priest may be removed from his cure and lose all authority to act as a minister, but his ministerial character cannot be taken from him.

So far as authority is concerned, no jurisdiction can give it beyond its own sphere. From this point of view ordination is valid only for the religious body or Church which gives it, and for no other body whatever. A minister who wishes to remove from one Church to another Church has to receive authority from that new jurisdiction before he can exercise his ministry therein. They may recognise his ordination as valid so far as his ministerial character is concerned, but not so far as giving him the right to exercise his ministry within their jurisdiction. All denominations receive ministers from other bodies with ceremonies appropriate to the occasion but varying in character, which impart to them the authority to exercise the ministry under their jurisdiction.

The ministry of other Protestant Churches who wish to become ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church are made such by ordination to the diaconate and the priesthood. The question now arises, Does such an ordination imply the conferring of ministerial character for the first time or only the authority to use it within the bounds of the Protestant Episcopal Church? There is a difference of opinion on this subject which goes back to the seventeenth century. These differences of opinion do not determine the intention of the Church either one way or the other. The intention of the Church should be sought in the minds of those who made the Ordinal, in the Ordinal itself and in the consensus of opinion about it. None of these justify the opinion that the reordination of Presbyterian ministers was designed to imprint character. It is only the impartation of ministerial authority.

The Church of England and its daughters have never officially denied the validity of Presbyterian Orders but have only insisted upon episcopal ordination in order to exercise the ministry within its jurisdiction. That is the view with which Bishop Leighton accepted episcopal ordination.

That is the view with which it was given to me and with which I accepted it. And this has been the view of a great many others in the several centuries since the Reformation.

This is, doubtless, distasteful to the Anglo-Catholic party, but, as we have seen, they do not represent the Anglican reformers and they cannot force their opinion into the Ordinal with whose origin and early history they had nothing to do.

We have seen that the consecration of a bishop is not an ordination, but a consecration, which does not in the Church of England confer any ministerial functions but only the authority and jurisdiction of a bishop over a diocese. Just so the ordination of a Presbyterian minister by a bishop does not confer ministerial functions but only authority to exercise those functions within a particular jurisdiction or cure.

The difficulty that is felt by those who think such an ordination to be a reflection upon their ministerial character is that they do not distinguish in ordination between the bestowal of ministerial character and the grant of authority and jurisdiction. The laying on of hands does not in itself imply the imprinting of a character, for such laying on of hands is used for many different things. As Estcourt says:

> Thus the imposition of hands is given to constitute the abbot in his office, not to confer an Order; and the prayers are made for his sanctification and perseverance in grace, not for a sacramental consecration. (*Loc. cit.*, p. 197.)

There are two alternate forms in the ordering of a priest in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first the same as that of the Church of England, the second added at the organisation of the American Church because of misconceptions of the priest's functions in the forgiveness of sins, as follows:

> *Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands.*

The American bishop may use either of these forms; the first emphasizes the functions, the second the authority to use the functions. So far as the second goes, the phrase

"in the Church of God" seems to be universal, but it practically means no more than the Protestant Episcopal Church, and it would have been wiser and better to say so; for no other denomination of Christians will recognise that authority within its jurisdiction.

The original form of the Church of England certainly intended to imprint character. But it may not do so in the case of one who has already received ministerial character by Presbyterian ordination. If it be said that the same form cannot convey ministerial character in one case and not in another, it may be answered that this is exactly what it does or does not do in unconditional and conditional ordinations. Differences of opinion as to the validity of orders do not affect the conveyance of the grace of order whether it is bestowed or not as the circumstances require.

The fact is that the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America require ordination by bishops in order to exercise the functions of priesthood in these Churches. Inasmuch as these Churches have never officially denied the validity of Presbyterian orders for Presbyterian Churches; but, on the other hand, the founders of the Reformed Church of England, and the most representative divines for a century after the Reformation, recognised Presbyterian Orders as valid while still requiring Episcopal orders for ministry in the Church of England; it should be evident that the ordination of Presbyterian ministers entering the ministry of the Church of England and its daughters does not decide as to the validity of their orders so far as ministerial character and functions are concerned; but only so far as authority and jurisdiction are concerned.

The laying on of hands is the most appropriate ceremony for imparting ministerial authority and jurisdiction for priest and bishop, and it may mean no more in the one case than in the other. It were better that there should be two formulas, the one bestowing ministerial character, authority and jurisdiction, the other bestowing only the latter. But, in the division of opinion that exists at the present time, this could

not easily be accomplished. The two interpretations of the ordination or reordination of Presbyterian ministers have long existed side by side, and they will continue for some time to come. All that we need contend for is that the formula may convey ministerial character or it may not, according to the circumstances of the case; and, therefore, that no one need fear lest he should compromise his ministry in other denominations by accepting episcopal ordination for a ministry in the Church of England or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The results thus far attained are confirmed by the consideration of the three functions of the Christian ministry in their bearing on the question of Orders.

1. *The Prophetic Function.*—It is universally recognised that the prophetic function is one of the great functions of the Christian ministry. It includes teaching and preaching, and various kinds and spheres of each. Some ministers have greater gifts than others in this regard. In some this gift is but small. Now, if this prophetic gift had fallen into disuse, would that invalidate the Christian ministry? Some of the early Puritans thought so, and called Roman Catholic and even Anglican priests who could not preach "dumb dogs." [1]

There can be no doubt that the great mass of the Roman Catholic priests and even bishops and popes, in the centuries before the Reformation, did no preaching at all. Even in Rome preaching was abandoned several times for long periods. Who dare affirm that the Christian ministry expired in those who were dumb in this sacred function of Prophecy?

2. *The Royal Function.*—There can be no doubt that the royal function of government and discipline belongs to the Christian ministry. It has never been taken away altogether from the priest so far as his own parish is concerned; but in this he has often been restricted and subjected to tyrannical interference by bishops and other prelates, and his rights

[1] Is. lvi. 10.

as a minister of Christ seriously impaired. He has been deprived altogether of his share in the general government of the Church, and has been reduced to bondage under an absolute despotism in many parts of the Christian world. That is the situation at present in the Roman Catholic Church. Even the bishops have been deprived of their authority and reduced to bondage under the Pope. Does this impairment of his royal functions deprive the priest of his Christian ministry? Does this absorption of all authority in the Pope make him the only valid Christian priest? No one can rightly say such things.

3. *The Priestly Function.*—When now we consider the priestly function of the ministry, it may be admitted that in the Protestant ministry that function has been reduced to a minimum. Even if we should go so far as to say, with the Pope, that the sacrificial priesthood was rejected by the Protestant Reformers and no longer exists in the Protestant ministry, would that destroy the ministry of the Protestant Churches? We ought not to say so.

If the priestly function is at the minimum among Protestants, the prophetic and the royal functions are both in vigorous use, and much more effective than they have ever been before in Christian history. All Protestant ministers intend to be just such ministers as they think Jesus Christ and his apostles intended. So far as they fall short of the ideal ministry, it is a sin of ignorance and not a sin of intention.

On the other hand, the royal function of the priesthood is reduced to a minimum in the Roman Catholic Church, and the great mass of Catholic priests for centuries lost all power to use the prophetic function, and, if we mistake not, even now the greater part of the priests seldom if ever preach. Here, again, the Roman Catholic priesthood fall far short of the Master's ideal; the only thing in which they excel is the priestly function.

If the priestly function were the one great essential function of the presbyter, then the Protestant ministry might be discredited as it is by the Roman Catholics. If the prophetic

function of the presbyter were the one great essential function, then the Roman Catholic ministry might be discredited as it has been by Protestants. But if the Christian ministry is endowed with the three functions in harmonious proportions, then the failure of any one of them, on occasion or in individuals, cannot destroy the ministry however greatly it may impair its usefulness. The Roman Catholics have much to learn from the Protestants and the Protestants much to learn from the Roman Catholics. The ideal ministry intended by Jesus Christ and his apostles is much more comprehensive and efficient than either or than both combined.

What, it may be asked, is episcopal character? What character does a bishop receive at his consecration that he did not have already as priest? If it be said that the priest's character is extended, to what is it extended? The bishop is no more of a priest than he was before. The consecration does not extend or intensify his priestly functions except so far as jurisdiction is concerned in making him a higher priest. Experience shows that the bishops are not usually as good priests as parish priests, because their official duties lead them away and make it difficult for them to exercise their priestly functions so often or so fruitfully as they did before they became bishops.

The bishop is no more a prophet than he was before. The great preachers and teachers of the Church are rarely bishops, at least in modern times; and such bishops as excel in this function attained their excellence before they became bishops and not subsequent to their episcopal consecration.

The bishop has no more of the royal function than before except so far as he uses the function in a higher and more extended jurisdiction. If he intrudes into the royal function of his priests, it is by usurpation and not because he has more of the royal function of the ministry. Just here is the habitual sin of the episcopate. They too often show that their royal function has not been extended by consecration; their striving after power and lordship over their brethren makes

it evident that they are lacking in Christ's royal gift. The Master said:

> Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. (Mk. x, 42–44, Mtth. xx, 25–27.)

The supposed special ministerial character of bishops is a delusion and a snare; and when you search for it, you find nothing more than superior jurisdiction, which is not ministerial character or episcopal character, except it be taken in an unwarranted and unnatural sense.

VIII. RESTORATION OF THE EPISCOPATE

It is usual to think of the restoration of the episcopate to those Churches which have it not, very much as in the case of the restoration of episcopacy to the Church of Scotland at the Restoration in 1661. But from the point of view of episcopal consecration as giving the power of jurisdiction, that consecration was irregular. What jurisdiction had the Anglican bishops over the Church of Scotland? How could they give a jurisdiction which was not theirs to give? It is only by attributing to episcopal consecration something which the ancient Canon Law does not allow, that such a consecration can be justified.

A superior jurisdiction, such as that of the Pope over the entire Catholic Church, might give jurisdiction to bishops of national Churches, but the bishops of one national Church cannot give it to another national Church. Therefore we must abandon the thought of the Church of England restoring episcopates to other nations.

The episcopates of Norway and Sweden seem to have episcopal succession very much as the Church of England. The episcopate of Denmark, however, received its jurisdiction from the only body competent to give it, the presbyters of the national Church of Denmark acting under the au-

thority of the whole Church. The presbyters of this country consecrated their bishops, just as in ancient times bishops were selected, consecrated and enthroned by their presbyters. The one episcopate is as valid as the other. It would gain nothing whatever by a reconsecration by Anglican bishops.

The same situation emergcs with reference to the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. These bishops have received their jurisdiction from the only body compctent to give it, the General Conference, and the consecration provided by the laws of that Church. This great denomination of Christians could not recognise thc superior jurisdiction of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church and receive jurisdiction from them.

The Anglicans are hugging to their bosom a very peculiar and unjustifiable theory of the episcopate as a higher order in grace, having special ministerial character and functions, as well as jurisdiction, which theory must be put aside in order to justify the Anglican episcopate itself, and in order to promote the re-establishment of episcopacy in the non-episcopal Churches.

Other Christian Churches, when they are ready to add the episcopate to their Presbyterian organisation, will doubtless be glad of the co-operation of bishops of sister Churches in the consecration of their bishops; but such an arrangement will be one of sisterly courtesy and intercommunion, not one of episcopal prerogative.

The Pope is not invested with his office by anothcr pope, but, having been elected by the college of cardinals, he is consecrated by bishops. So the patriarchs of the Churches of the East do not go to other patriarchs for induction in their higher jurisdiction, but are consecratcd by bishops. Bishops are consecrated by other bishops appointed for the purpose by some higher jurisdiction. But if there be no higher jurisdiction in a national or denominational Church than a General Assembly or Conference or Association or Synod, or any other college of presbyters; then that college as the supreme judicatory of the Church may, through rep-

resentative presbyters appointed for the purpose, make the consecration of bishops; and that consecration is just as valid as one made by other bishops in an episcopal organisation, however irregular it may be, as contrary to the prevailing usage of the Christian Church.

Such a consecration of bishops by presbyters becomes necessary owing to the divisions of the Church into a number of national Churches and denominational Churches, in which situation no foreign Church or different denomination can rightly consecrate through its bishops; because these foreign Churches and different denominations have no proper jurisdiction over other Churches than their own.

The Anglican bishops felt this difficulty when they consecrated bishops for the newly organised Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. A special Act of Parliament was necessary, and the approval of the King of England, to give the English bishops the authority to consecrate foreign bishops. And even then it could only be justified by the fact that they had been requested by the infant American Episcopal Church to do so, and that they were consecrating bishops to a missionary jurisdiction.

The consecration of the American and the Scottish bishops by bishops of the Church of England cannot be regarded as precedents for the consecration of bishops of other national Churches or of other denominations of Christians in Great Britain and America. They were anomalous actions not strictly justifiable by Canon Law, and they really gave nothing more to those bishops than they would have received if they had been consecrated by presbyters appointed by the jurisdiction which selected them for bishops.

IX. RECOGNITION OF ORDERS

If there is ever to be a Reunion of Christ's Church, the theories and prejudices of the different national Churches and religious denominations, and parties in the same, must be put aside and an agreement made upon the basis of facts and lawful precedents.

The difficulty here is not as to the future; that will take care of itself. The difficulty is in making the transition. The difficulty is with the theory of the three orders of the ministry as resting on divine right. Those in the Episcopal Churches who do not accept this theory would have little difficulty in recognising the validity of Presbyterian ordination as to essence. Presbyterian ordination has all the virtue in it that the laying on of the hands of the presbyters can impart. It only lacks that virtue that comes from the bishop's hands. There can be little doubt that ordination has been carefully guarded in Presbyterian Churches. No minister enters the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain without the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, or body of presbyters, with a moderator presiding over them. The Presbyteries of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain, when the Episcopal Church was disestablished, had been ordained with few exceptions by episcopal as well as presbyterial ordination. Those few had been ordained by the Presbyteries of Swiss, French, Dutch and German Churches in the same orderly manner. The founders of the Presbyterian Church were regularly ordained, at least a sufficient number of them, even according to the highest theory of the episcopal function.

If these presbyters were entitled to share with bishops in the ordination of other presbyters, in accordance with the lawful practice of the ancient Churches and the Church of England and her daughters, so far as they could transmit authority as presbyters; they transmitted it to the presbyters that they ordained. If they transmitted anything when ordaining with bishops, they transmitted the same when ordaining without bishops. What is lacking, therefore, and the only thing that is lacking in the ordination of Presbyterian ministers, is that virtue and that alone that comes from the diocesan bishop's hands. Presbyterial ordination, therefore, may be incomplete, but it is an ordination in part, so far as presbyters can ordain. If ordination belongs to the bishop alone, then Presbyterian ministers have not been ordained.

If presbyters are simply the attendants of the bishop, and their participation adds nothing to the ordination, then Presbyterian ministers are not ordained. But if the participation of Presbyters has some importance, if their participation in ordination communicates any grace or authority, then they may communicate that grace and authority whenever they are properly organised as a Presbytery to act.

It may be asked, which, indeed, is the more valid ordination—that by presbyters without a bishop, or that by bishop without presbyters. The authority of the Scriptures can be cited for the former, but the latter has been regarded as irregular, even in Episcopal Churches; and yet such irregular ordinations have taken place in the Church of England. Against them the Puritans rightly complained. And yet these ordinations by bishops alone, that were irregular, were not regarded as invalid. Why, then, should ordination by presbyters alone be regarded as invalid?

The Church of Scotland is an independent National Church, as truly a National Church as the Church of England, and so recognised at the settlement of the Revolution. Those who question the validity of the ordination of the ministry of that Church and her daughters, from the point of view of the National Church of England and her daughters, have no more warrant so to do than the Church of Scotland would have to deny the validity of the ordination of the ministry of the Church of England and her daughters. The two Churches were organised by ecclesiastical and civil law, and are on an equality before the Law in Great Britain. The Church of England is Episcopal and the Presbyterian Church of England is dissenting. The Church of Scotland is Presbyterian, and the Episcopal Church of Scotland is dissenting. In the United States the daughters of these two National Churches are on an equality before the Law; the one is as much the Church of the United States as the other. The two National Churches have different theories and methods of ordination. The one is as regular and lawful as the other,

and there is as genuine apostolical succession in the one as in the other. The Church of Scotland has her succession through the presbyter-bishops. The Church of England traces her succession through the diocesan bishops and presbyters. On the theory of three orders by divine right the Presbyterial ordination is valid only so far as the order of presbyters is concerned, and invalid for the failure of the bishop's hands. But on the theory that the bishop is only *jure humano*, and therefore not necessary to the existence of the Church, where a national Church is organised without diocesan bishops, ordination by presbyters is valid and orderly. All who do not accept the *jure divino* theory of the Episcopate should agree to this.

The difficulties in the way of the recognition of Presbyterian ordination are ancient difficulties that we should feel bound to respect and to remove if possible. The difficulty is practically this: If a Presbyterian should apply for admission to the Episcopal Church, it would be necessary for him to be confirmed and ordained. If an Episcopal minister should seek admission to the Presbyterian Church, it would be necessary for him to be received into a Presbytery after examination and his subscription to the Westminster Confession. The difficulty in the one case would be *ceremonial*, in the other case it would be *doctrinal subscription*. These barriers are purely ecclesiastical ones. They are fences set up in the interest of the good order of the Church. Let us consider the additional difficulties the Presbyterian fathers had in their way. In 1661 two thousand parish ministers were thrust out of their charges in England because they could not take the following oaths: (1) Non-resistance and passive obedience to bishop and king; (2) Conformity to the Liturgy; (3) Renouncing the Solemn League and Covenant to which they had previously sworn. During the Presbyterian supremacy hundreds of parish priests had been removed because they refused to swear to the Covenant. No one could be ordained during that period, and subsequently, according to the Directory, who did not take "the

Covenant of the three kingdoms." It was not simply a matter of ordination on either side. These fences have been broken down; others still remain.

It would be possible for the Presbyterian Church to waive its right of examination, and to reduce its subscription from the Westminster Confession to the Nicene Creed. It would be possible in the Protestant Episcopal Church to waive the ceremony of confirmation in the admission of members of Presbyterian Churches, and to waive the ceremony of ordination for those who had been ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

I was informed by high authority immediately after the adjournment of one of the Lambeth Conferences that a very considerable proportion of that Conference would be willing to recognise Presbyterian ordination under certain conditions, but that the time had not come to take definite action. Bishop Vincent confirms this testimony when he says:

> But one expedient so far has been proposed which promises to meet the difficulty in any practical way, and that is the proposition of Bishop Charles Wordsworth, of the Scottish Church, made through a committee of the last Lambeth Conference. It was substantially this: that we should now recognise the full ministerial standing of clergymen presbyterially ordained, providing that hereafter all their ordinations should be by bishops. The report of the committee says: "While the Church in her Twenty-third Article lays down the necessity of the ministry as a sacred order, commissioned by 'those who have public authority given them in the congregation'; and while for *herself* she has defined this expression by insisting in her own communion on *Episcopal* ordination, she has nowhere declared that all other constituted ministry is null and void." This proposition was not accepted by the Conference, and probably for two good reasons, if for no other: because it was not prepared to act so suddenly in so serious a matter, and also because, being only a Conference, it had no authority so to act. But it should also be said that ten out of the twelve members of the committee voted for it, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his "very full and hearty sympathy with it." (*Address on Church Unity*, pp. 34–36.)

The denominations are all proceeding on a theory of ordination in the Church, which was sufficiently valid when

there was but one National Church, which could impart authority to a minister to exercise the functions of a presbyter anywhere in the land. But this is no longer the case. In America an Episcopal ordination does not give a minister as wide an opportunity of usefulness as Presbyterian ordination; Presbyterian ordination does not give as wide an opportunity of ministerial service as ordination to the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Each of the denominations ordains its own ministry, and the ministers thus ordained are divided into different camps.

The question arises, why ordained ministers should not go from one denomination to another. The difficulty in the way is a lack of organic union between the denominations. If there were such an organic union by the way of federation in the constitution of a council representing the supreme courts of all the denominations, then the organic union thus consummated would be able to arrange for the mutual recognition of the ministry and work of the several branches of the reunited Church. The recognition of the validity of presbyterial ordination would not remove the difficulty unless it be connected with federation or consolidation. It would remove a strife of words and misapprehensions of many kinds, but it would not make the presbyter of one denomination into a presbyter in another denomination. There are two ways of accomplishing this. The one is for a considerable number of presbyters to become presbyters in two or more denominations at the same time, and thus become connecting links pulling them together. The other is for all organised bodies of presbyters to become members of a larger body, comprehending in one vast organism all the ministry of the nation.

It should be recognised by common consent that the presbyter-bishop is the one essential minister of Christ's Church existing in valid ordination and real apostolic succession in all Christian Churches; and that the episcopal office is a superior jurisdiction resting upon historic right and not on Biblical right; and that the diaconate is an order of assistant

ministers that may be extended into various subdivisions or minor orders of men and women.

The three great functions of the presbyter should be recognised and urged upon the presbyter, and he should be thoroughly trained in them all, although differences of gifts should be discerned; and great efficiency in all of these functions should not be exacted of every presbyter.

The Protestant Churches should give the minor orders a better recognition and the dignity of consecration or ordination as do the more ancient Churches.

The Presbyterian, Congregational and Lutheran Churches should establish the episcopate as the much-needed executive in their bodies. All Churches should establish judicial church courts, and so distinguish the three functions of government as in the best modern States. If the various Church governments could be assimilated to the civil government in this regard, many differences in Church government would disappear, or at least be removed from the sphere of essentials to that of non-essentials and variables.

If Protestants could go as far as this, why should they not go farther still and carry the executive office up into archbishops of provinces, primates or patriarchs of nations, and the Pope as the universal Bishop? Why not carry the legislative function higher than General Assembly, Convention, or Association, or Conference, or Convocation—whatever the national college of ministers may be called—into the Œcumenical Council of all Christians meeting at stated intervals? Why not carry the judicial function higher into a supreme court of Christendom? Church Unity, if it is to be carried out and result in a world-wide Christian Church, with one thorough-going organisation, must come to this. Then the Unity of Christ's Church will be manifest, not by thin lines attaching the Churches to one another here and there at particular points, or by the consensus eliminated by scholars from the noisy and confusing dissensus which envelops the Churches as a dreary mist of prejudices, misinterpretations and misunderstandings; but it will shine forth

in the sunlight of the Redeemer's countenance from the very face and form of his bride whom he has at last "presented to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing," but "holy and without blemish."[1]

[1] Eph. v. 27

VI

ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is the jurisdiction which the Church has the authority to exercise in the administration of government and discipline. In modern times, especially in the United States of America, the government of the nation divides itself into three channels—the legislative, the judicial and the executive. The Christian Church has not developed in its government so far as the modern State. The three functions of government in Congregationalism are lodged in one democratic body, the congregation, a society of Christians in covenant relations with each other.

In Presbyterianism, the three functions of government are lodged in the Presbytery. But inasmuch as there are several grades of presbyteries—the parochial presbytery, the classical presbytery, the synodical and the national assemblies—we have to distinguish between original jurisdiction, which belongs to the classical presbytery in the case of a minister, and to the parochial presbytery in the case of a layman, and appellate jurisdiction, which belongs to the superior and the supreme bodies. But all of these presbyteries alike have legislative, judicial and executive functions to fulfil. Any presbytery may sit whenever it pleases and enact legislative rules, or it may sit as a court and decide cases of discipline, or it may act as an executive body and exercise episcopal functions.

In the Episcopal Churches the bishop is the executive, but in most Episcopal Churches he also assumes the authority to legislate and to discipline within his diocese. In England, the Church has developed ecclesiastical courts of a mixed and altogether unsatisfactory character. In the

Protestant Episcopal Church in this country there is a rudimentary ecclesiastical court in the provision for the appointment of courts by bishops, and also provincial courts of appeal in questions of law. The Protestant Episcopal Church in this country has separated the legislative function and assigned it to the two houses of the General Convention, but the Church of England lags behind in this particular. In Lutheran Germany, the general superintendent is the executive, and the consistory combines the legislative and the judicial functions. The Synod is a development of recent years.

This brief survey makes it clear that no ecclesiastical organisation has yet attained the stage of development in government and discipline which we see in the civil government of the chief modern nations. It is necessary that we should recognise: (1) that the jurisdiction of the Church assumes a different form in the different ecclesiastical organisations in accordance with their theory of government and their practice of discipline; and (2) that the jurisdiction of the Church shapes itself differently from the jurisdiction of the civil government because of the difference in the stage of development of government in the Church and in the State.

It is commonly agreed that all ecclesiastical authority is derived from Jesus Christ, the enthroned king of the kingdom of God, the sole head of his body, the Church. It is also agreed that Jesus Christ himself calls his ministry into the field. Jesus Christ himself appoints the earthly governors of his Church. Those whom he has appointed, and no others, have authority in the Church. The jurisdiction of the Church springs from the divine authority imparted by King Jesus to his ministers. The ancient Anabaptists, the Society of Friends, the Independents, the Plymouth Brethren, and other sects, think that every Christian is called of God to be a ruler and minister in the Church. They build on the universal royal-priesthood of all believers. But other bodies of Christians agree that ecclesiastical authority is lodged in the ordained ministry who have been called by the

King, Jesus himself, and have been ordained by the Church. The old Congregationalists lodged the authority in the parochial presbytery, and refused to recognise any appellate jurisdiction. Each parochial presbytery was independent of every other and responsible to Christ alone. Presbyterians, however, asserted that the Church was one, and that there was appellate jurisdiction from the lower presbyteries to the higher, and they even contemplated an œcumenical Presbytery. With few exceptions, and those chiefly of late date, appellate jurisdiction in all its stages is coextensive with original jurisdiction. The Episcopal form of government intensifies the diocese and its jurisdiction. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States limits episcopacy to the diocese. There is no bishop of the bishops. Accordingly, the diocese is more independent than in any other Episcopal Church in the world. There is no appellate jurisdiction in executive acts. The appellate jurisdiction is confined, for the most part, to legislative functions. There are certain executive acts which have to do with the whole Church. There is no executive for these acts, although there is a rudimentary one in the senior bishop. Above the diocese, the Protestant Episcopal Church is essentially Presbyterian in its organisation. All appellate jurisdiction is lodged in the two houses of the General Convention. England and Ireland have retained the archbishoprics of Canterbury, York, Dublin and Armagh, and there is appellate jurisdiction from the diocesan to the metropolitan. When the Church of England renounced the appellate jurisdiction of Rome, it became a national Church, and has never contemplated œcumenical relations. It has its unity as a national Church through the Crown only.

The Greek and Oriental Churches developed the patriarchate at an early date, and the great historic patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople were established. These had appellate jurisdiction over the metropolitans. All of these patriarchates became subject to the Moslem dominion, and were restricted by that dominion in

their jurisdiction; but they still retained it. The patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, however, became subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople, who is the head of the Greek Church. The orthodox Church of Russia has its centre of unity in the patriarch of Moscow, who is nominally under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople also.

The Western Church did not develop the patriarchate, but the see of Rome from the earliest times has been supreme over the Western Church, and from early times the Pope claimed to be the œcumenical bishop. The Church of Rome is, therefore, the only œcumenical Church in its ecclesiastical organisation. It is the only one in which appellate jurisdiction is really exercised over Churches in many different nations. It is the only Church in which the episcopal organisation has reached its complete development, and in which appellate jurisdiction regulated by Canon Law is complete and thorough.

The organisation of the Greek and Oriental Churches is national organisation. The Episcopal Churches of England, Sweden and Denmark, the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Holland and several of the Cantons of Switzerland, and the Consistorial Churches of Germany, are national Churches, established by statute law in those nations. The many modern denominations in Great Britain and America have no national existence, and their jurisdiction is limited to those who voluntarily adhere to them.

The old Presbyterians and Episcopalians agreed with the ancient Greek, Roman and Oriental Churches that, in addition to the internal call of Christ to the ministry, there must be an external call and ordination by the Church, in order to the exercise of ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction. The authority of the Church to give this external call comes from the institution of the ministry by Christ and his apostles, and depends upon the transmission of that authority in the Church from the apostles' times. There is a difference of opinion among theologians, whether this transmission is

through the presbyters, or through the bishops, or through the entire ecclesiastical organisation.

In the Christian world, then, there are numbers of ecclesiastical organisations which claim authority from Christ by the internal call, and from the Church by the external call, which have some plausible historic right, and which exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The problem, from the point of view of Church Unity, is how these jurisdictions, which are at present independent, indifferent one to another, or hostile, may be united in one jurisdiction. There may be Christian Unity without unity of jurisdiction, but there can be no Church Unity without unity in jurisdiction.

The Roman Catholic Church claims jurisdiction over the whole world, and maintains that there is no other lawful Church in the world. This claim was recognised for centuries by the nations of Northern Europe, which are now Protestant nations. Rome regards all the Protestants as in rebellion. All modern denominations are usurpers. The Episcopal Church of England, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the Consistorial Churches of Germany, are all alike in rebellion. They have no valid ministry, no valid sacraments. They are as guilty of schism as the sects of Anabaptists and Quakers. They would be dealt with by the ecclesiastical courts and given over to the civil authorities for punishment, if the Roman Church had freedom to exercise its authority which it derives from Jesus Christ. From the point of view of the ancient Roman Church and the ancient Canon Law, and from the point of view of Christendom before the Reformation, no other position can be taken. The appellate jurisdiction of the Church is in the Holy Father at Rome. It was so recognised by the English, German, Scottish, Scandinavian and Swiss nations for centuries. The Reformers, who rejected that appellate jurisdiction and rebelled against that discipline, separated themselves from the supreme ecclesiastical authority, and thereby lost ecclesiastical authority. They could not lawfully exercise jurisdiction in the Church, or transmit au-

thority to others to exercise jurisdiction. If we recognise the external unity of Christ's Church as the design of Christ himself, and see that unity in the Roman Catholic organisation for centuries, and agree that the decisions of the supreme appellate jurisdiction of the Church are final, then we must admit that there is no legal Church in Western Europe but the Roman.

We build the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Protestant Churches only upon the right of appeal from the highest tribunal of the Church to Christ, the head of the Church. The Reformers refused to submit to the appellate jurisdiction of the Pope, and declined to desist from the exercise of their ministry at his bidding; they appealed from the Pope to Christ. They exercised and perpetuated the functions of their ministry, although they were formally and technically irregular in so doing. The only way in which Roman Christianity and Protestant Christianity can legally combine is, for Protestant Christianity to frankly recognise the technical irregularity of the Reformation, its revolutionary and illegal character; and for the Roman Church to repeal and recall all its unrighteous discipline. Such a course is entirely practicable, for the Roman Catholic Church has never taken the position that the Church is infallible in its discipline. The efforts of some Anglicans, to make their ministerial succession independent of Rome in its transmission, results in grievous error. History frowns upon the effort. Canon Law does not admit of it. The disciplinary procedure of Rome was formally and technically legal according to Canon Law. The only thing about it that we can successfully challenge is the matter of the procedure. Rome erred in the grounds and reasons of the discipline, and therefore, when history has shown that those grounds and reasons were erroneous, the disciplinary action may be lawfully and in a regular manner reversed.

The Reformation was a revolution. The intolerable yoke of the appellate jurisdiction of Rome was thrown off, and each Protestant nation reorganised the Church in the

nation in its own way. In England the metropolitans and bishops were retained, and a Metropolitan Church was established by Law; in Scotland the metropolitans and bishops were discarded, and a Presbyterian Church was established by Law; in Germany the metropolitans and bishops were discarded, and Consistorial Churches were established by Law. In England the yoke of the prelatical bishops became intolerable, and the Puritans struggled until they threw it off, and the Church of England was established as a Presbyterian Church for a brief period. At the Restoration, through a breach of faith, two thousand Presbyterians were deprived of their parish churches and prohibited from exercising their ministry, without trial, and by arbitrary enactments; and the prelates became more tyrannical than ever. The struggle continucd until the Revolution settlement, when the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers and other religious persons were permitted to organise themselves as independent ecclesiastical bodies.

No one can survey the history of Christ's Church without seeing very plainly that the disruption of the Church has been due in the main to the intolerable tyranny of the appellate judicatories in the Church. There can be no Church Unity without unity in appellate jurisdiction. But there can be no unity in appellate jurisdiction unless that appellate jurisdiction can be so limited as to make it impracticable that there shall bc a recurrence of the intolerable injustice and tyranny under which our fathers suffered, and which still threatens us in all existing religious organisations which have appellate judicatories.

The question in Church Unity is, How far shall we go? Is it to be a diocesan unity, a national unity, or an œcumenical unity? If there is to be unity in any case, it must be in an appellate jurisdiction. Episcopacy finds the ultimate unity in the universal Bishop, Presbyterianism in the Œcumenical Council. If the Episcopalian says the historic episcopate is the principle of Church Unity, he cannot in his conception of Church Unity go beyond the diocese;

unless he sums up the dioceses in a provincial bishop who can be no other than an archbishop. A house of bishops, with a house of clerical and lay deputies, is the Presbyterian system for a national organisation. A house of bishops is one house of a legislative, judicial and executive body; but the executive function is lodged in a body, as truly as it is in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and not in a bishop; it is therefore unepiscopal. The episcopal system unfolds into an archbishop of a province, the patriarch of a nation, and the holy father of the world, just as truly as the classical presbytery unfolds and reaches its ultimate form in the Œcumenical Council. Unless we are prepared to go as far as this, we cannot think of œcumenical unity; we must limit ourselves to national unity or diocesan unity.

We have thus, then, reached three conclusions: (1) We must unfold ecclesiastical jurisdiction much further in the line of the development of civil jurisdiction; (2) We must seek appellate jurisdiction in national and œcumenical ecclesiastical organisations; (3) We must so limit the appellate jurisdictions as to conserve the rights of individuals and of the lower judicatories, and make it impracticable that the appellate judicatories should tyrannise over the inferior judicatories. To this last proposition we shall now give our attention, summing up the exercise of jurisdiction under the three divisions, territorial jurisdiction, the subject-matter of jurisdiction, and jurisdiction of persons.

I. TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

The theory of Church government which is held more or less tenaciously by all organised Churches is, that there can be but one lawful Church of Jesus Christ in one territory. Where two or more claim to exist, their claims are unlawful. They are schismatic and rebellious against the one Church of Christ. In the New Testament we find nowhere more than one church in a city. The New Testament does

not contemplate a Church divided into a number of independent organisations in the same territory. The Christian Church asserted its unity in every country and nation in every century until the Reformation. It was regarded as intolerable that there should be any ecclesiastical jurisdiction but one in any diocese or nation. All schism was treated as rebellion and remorselessly crushed. The Church in the Roman Empire asserted its unity and trampled underfoot every heresy and schism. The breaking of the unity was due to the rise of the independent nations. The strife of the Papacy against the national spirit, through the centuries prior to the Reformation, necessarily prepared the way for the organisation of the national Churches of Northern Europe. But these national Churches refused to recognise any other ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the nation than the one established by law as the national Church. Roman Catholics battled for existence in Northern Europe. Puritans struggled for existence in Great Britain. Various sects suffered persecution in the different Protestant countries. Only in quite recent times has toleration been granted. Religious equality is scarcely known outside the United States of America. Even among us, churchmen of the different denominations regard it as a necessary evil. There are few thinking men who will say that the ecclesiastical situation in this country is desirable or permanent. The fact is that our theories of Church government were evolved in a time when all men insisted upon the divine right of Church government and the exclusive territorial jurisdiction of their form of government. We are all of us, consciously or unconsciously, under the influence of the territorial principle. Let us, then, consider the working out of this principle.

The fundamental territorial division is the parish, which embraces all the people living within a certain district. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of this parish is independent of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of other parishes. They have their unity in an appellate jurisdiction of a classical presbytery, or a diocesan bishop, or any other higher organisation,

It has always been regarded as unlawful for the authorities of one parish to intrude into another parish. The parish system is retained wherever there are Churches established by law. There is considerable friction between the parish churches and the dissenting churches which occupy the same territory in the larger part of Great Britain. But the established Churches guard against intrusion of one parish into another. In the United States, where there is no Church established by law, there are no parish churches. The same district of territory is occupied by several different denominations; and even in the same denominations it is practically impossible to prevent one congregation from encroaching on the field of another. The communicants of the congregations are intermingled with the communicants of other congregations of the same denomination, and territorial jurisdiction no longer exists so far as congregations are concerned. Each denomination endeavours to preserve territorial divisions in the appellate jurisdictions, but with only partial success. It is comparatively easy to do this with pastors of congregations, but it is difficult, and in fact impracticable, to do it with ministers without charge. Sometimes it is impracticable to preserve territorial lines with congregations. Two congregational associations coexisted for many years in the same territory of New York and Brooklyn; they united a short time ago. There were several presbyteries in New York and vicinity prior to the Reunion of the Presbyterian Church in 1870. These were not divided by denominational or territorial lines. It is far better, when ministers and congregations cannot work together in harmony, that they should arrange themselves in two or more local bodies, according to their preferences, rather than undertake the organisation of two denominations.

The principle of non-intrusion into presbyteries and dioceses has been so overridden as practically to be destroyed by recent events. The Andover case destroyed it for Congregationalists, the Briggs case for Presbyterians, and a recent pastoral letter of the bishops destroyed it for Episco-

palians. The Law of the Presbyterian Church prohibits presbyteries from intruding upon the disciplinary procedure of other presbyteries; and yet a large number of presbyteries overtured the General Assembly in 1891, condemning the inaugural of Professor Briggs, and urging the veto of his transfer to the chair of Biblical Theology. The General Assembly, under the influence of a panic, voted the veto, and condemned him and the Directors of Union Seminary without giving them a hearing, while the case of Professor Briggs was in the early stages of process before the presbytery of New York. The House of Bishops intruded upon the dioceses of Massachusetts and of Philadelphia in a pastoral letter which related to matters in discussion in those dioceses that the bishops of those dioceses were alone entitled to handle. Such acts of intrusion were contrary to the principles of Canon Law and the disciplinary practice of the Church. They show that territorial jurisdiction has broken down in this country, and that the general religious bodies no longer respect the original territorial jurisdiction of inferior judicatories.

The interrelation of the denominations has done still more to destroy territorial jurisdiction. In the holy city, Jerusalem, several episcopal jurisdictions coexist. Even in the church of the Holy Sepulchre several different rites of several different episcopal jurisdictions are celebrated. The Roman Church does not recognise the valid jurisdiction of any orders but her own. From her point of view she cannot be guilty of intrusion anywhere in the world. But Anglicans recognise the validity of Roman orders. They claim to be the national Church of England. The Church of England is established by law in England, but nowhere else in the world. It cannot escape the charge of intrusion, therefore, when it erects congregations in Roman Catholic countries subject to the bishop of London. It seems to be rather inconsistent, therefore, to make a stand against the erection of an American episcopate in Mexico and an Anglican episcopate in Madrid or in Jerusalem. It is only a

difference of degree whether the bishop of Oxford intrudes into a Roman Catholic diocese by the erection of a congregation in Florence, or the archbishop of Dublin erects a diocese in the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Madrid. In New York City we have an episcopal diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a metropolitan of the Roman Catholic Church coexisting in the same territory. The Roman Catholic does not recognise the validity of the orders of the Protestant Episcopal diocese, but the Protestant Episcopal diocese recognises the orders of the Roman Catholic clergy. In England the Church of England is established by law, and so may charge the Roman clergy with intrusion. No such charge can be made in New York, because there is no establishment of religion. The Episcopal Church has not been the established Church in that city since the colonial period. There can be no question of intrusion where the Law does not determine territorial right.

The first Roman Catholic bishop of the United States was Carroll, of Baltimore, 1789; the first unquestioned bishops of the Anglican Order were White and Provost of 1787. The circumstances of the origin of the episcopate for this country do not give any prior right to either line of bishops. The validity of the American bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church depends on the validity of Anglican orders. The Moravians were prior in their episcopate to all others in this country, and they seem to have apostolic succession for their episcopacy. But, in fact, no valid claim to jurisdiction can be founded on priority of occupation of a territory. The question depends on which episcopate had the territorial right by ecclesiastical Law. Each one had the right in ecclesiastical Law of establishing missionary bishoprics. The same ecclesiastical right is exercised in all missionary lands, so that in all North America, in Central and Eastern Asia, and in all Africa, except Egypt and Abyssinia, where ancient Churches still continue, bishops of the several Episcopal Churches occupy the same territory without intrusion. The result is inevitable that, with the progress of Christianity, the

greater part of the world will be under the jurisdiction of coexisting bishoprics. When we thus consider the intrusion of Rome into all Protestant lands, and the intrusion of other episcopates into Roman Catholic countries, we see that the territorial jurisdiction of the Church has been virtually destroyed. It has been condemned by the historic judgment of God. It is improbable that it will ever be restored.

It would remove a great embarrassment from the advance toward Church Unity if territorial jurisdiction should be discarded altogether. It is impracticable at present to attain territorial unity. It is improbable that it ever will be practicable. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is very much like marine jurisdiction. Each nation has jurisdiction over its own ships on the sea, but no jurisdiction over the sea itself. The Church, in fact, has no jurisdiction over territory, but only over certain persons and things in a territory.

II. THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF JURISDICTION

1. *Doctrines*

The Roman Catholic Church claims universal sway as to matters of jurisdiction as well as to territory. The jurisdiction of the Church in Protestant lands has been limited more and more, until at present it is practically confined to spiritual things, religion, doctrine and morals. There are many things in which Church and State have what may be called concurrent jurisdiction: in marriage and divorce, in education, in sabbath observance, and in the regulation of vice; but, in fact, the jurisdiction of the Church is limited by the State, and is ordinarily confined to the spiritual side of these matters.

Matters of religion are those which have to do chiefly with the worship of God, *e. g.*, the order of worship, ceremonies and sacred times. These are matters which belong to the jurisdiction of the Church. On these matters the several denominations differ exceedingly. The religious conflicts

in Great Britain and America have been due largely to the desire for uniformity in religion. The Chicago-Lambeth Articles happily limit religious uniformity to the two sacraments, with the invariable use of the elements ordained by Christ and the words of institution. If we could limit jurisdiction in matters of religion to the terms of this article, we would do away with almost all of the religious disputes in the Church and gain unity of jurisdiction in matters of religion. But some questions arise. Does this article propose to limit all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters of religion to the uniformity prescribed by Christ in the celebration of the two sacraments, or does it propose simply to limit the supreme judicatory of a national Church to this jurisdiction and leave a wider jurisdiction in matters of religion to lower judicatories? Is it proposed that every congregation in every diocese shall be independent of episcopal jurisdiction in all matters of religion except this? If so, it involves the union of Roman Catholic, Greek, Protestant Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and other congregations in one and the same diocese under one diocesan jurisdiction. You may baptise by sprinkling, by pouring or by immersion, as the local congregation may determine. You may baptise children or not, as you please. You may celebrate the Lord's Supper after the Roman, Greek, Anglican or Presbyterian manner, without interference. You may have the confessional or you may reject it. You may do penance in public or you may repent in private. You may say masses for the dead; you may grant indulgences; you may bestow extreme unction. You may have the most elaborate ceremonies; you may have no ceremony at all. You may use the Book of Common Prayer, or the liturgies of the Reformed Churches, or the Lutheran liturgy, or the Mass Book, or make public prayer with no book at all. You may refuse to say in public the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer, or the Ten Commandments. You may worship in any way you please, if only you celebrate the two Sacraments with the use of the bread and the wine and the

water and the words of institution; and no bishop, or presbytery, or convention, or conference, or any other judicatory shall have any jurisdiction over any of these matters of religion.

We do not know how far this limitation of jurisdiction has been thought out by the bishops into its practical details. It is doubtful whether they would deem it wise to permit every congregation to use such unlimited discretion as this. It would be intolerable for some congregations to feel even a limited responsibility for the disorderly practices of other congregations in the same diocese. It is probable that the Chicago-Lambeth definition of what is essential in matters of religion should be taken as limiting the supreme judicatory of the national Church, so that it should not interfere with any inferior judicatory which was faithful to this article relating to the Sacraments, and so that it should recognise the jurisdiction of the lower judicatories as more extensive than that of the supreme judicatory. There should be a gradual limitation of jurisdiction in matters of religion as one ascends from the lowest judicatory to the highest. For those congregations which use the Book of Common Prayer, there is needed a judicatory to have jurisdiction over its use. There are in the Episcopal Church parties which differ in their ideas of worship. Each one of these parties might by elective affinity be organised in a convention under a bishop. Instead of increasing the number of bishops by territorial restrictions, the increase might be by divisions of dioceses in accordance with the subject-matter of jurisdiction. We might have in New York City not only a bishop of the Roman Order, a bishop of the Anglican Order and a bishop of the Moravian Order, but also other bishops acting as the executives of dioceses constituted no longer in accordance with a territorial jurisdiction, which is really impracticable, but in accordance with the elective affinity of the congregations. These dioceses might retain their independence under a common bishop by a constitutional limitation of his jurisdiction, or, if this union could not be consummated, these dioceses might be combined in an archdiocese under

a metropolitan, limited in his jurisdiction to the matters defined in the Chicago-Lambeth Articles.

The divisions of Christendom, however, have originated chiefly from differences in matters of Faith. The definitions of the Faith by superior and supreme judicatories have excluded those ministers or dioceses or provinces or patriarchates which could not subscribe to these definitions. In the evolution of the Faith of Christ's Church, every stage has resulted in the separation or exclusion of those who could not make the evolution. The Faith of the ancient Church was defined in the primitive Creeds. The great councils decided the Trinitarian and Christological controversies, and by their supreme jurisdiction cut off the adherents of Arianism and Nestorianism and other minor heresies. The Greek and Roman Churches condemned each other as heretical, and the East separated from the West. At the Reformation, Northern Europe separated from Southern Europe; but every effort to construct a united Protestant Church failed, owing to international jealousies and rivalries. Therefore the Roman Church declared its Faith at the Council of Trent, and each national Protestant Church declared its Faith in national confessions and catechisms. An effort was made to unite all Lutherans about the Form of Concord, and all Calvinists about the decrees of the Synod of Dort, but these efforts failed. The Westminster Confession was designed to take the place of the separate national confessions of the three nations of Great Britain, but this design was not accomplished. All of these later confessions became Confessions of the Faith of parties and denominations. The Articles of Religion became the legal statement of the Faith of the Church of England. The Westminster Confession became the legal confession of the Church of Scotland, and displaced the original Scottish Confessions. Ministers were now obliged by Law to subscribe to these confessions, and these mapped out an extensive area of jurisdiction for ecclesiastical bodies in matters of faith.

Doctrinal jurisdiction depends upon the definitions of the

creed or confession on the one side, and upon the terms of subscription on the other. Several questions now arise.

Do these confessions restrict the Church in its jurisdiction, or do they restrict the minister in his liberty, or do they restrict both Church and minister? Subscription was forced on the Church of Scotland by the Parliament of Scotland in order to restrict the jurisdiction of the Church of Scotland. That is, any man who subscribed to the Confession and was faithful to its articles was free as to any matters not defined in the Confession. But the older view of the Church of Rome was, that the Creeds restricted the minister, and that the jurisdiction of the Church was unrestricted. The Church had jurisdiction over other matters also. It was its right to define any matter of faith that was in dispute. The Decisions of the Church were a restriction to the minister, telling him what the Church had already said. This seems to be the historic position of the Church of England also. The American Churches, with written constitutions, follow in principle the method of the Church of Scotland, influenced doubtless by the method of the Constitution of the United States. But, in practice, ecclesiastical bodies refuse to be restrained by constitutional barriers. They decide any question raised before them whether they have the right so to do or not.

Does subscription bind to all matters stated in the Confession, or only to the essential and necessary articles? The Adopting Act of the American Presbyterian Church took the latter position, but it has not been adhered to in later decisions of General Assemblies, and this is not the usage of other ecclesiastical bodies.

Does subscription bind to the express statements only, or to all logical deductions also? If we take the latter position, it would seem that every logical deduction made by decision becomes an additional confessional statement. Can a minister be bound to such a logical deduction before it has been made by the decision of the supreme judicatory? Can the supreme judicatory make such an addition to the Faith

of the Church? All of these questions have arisen in the Presbyterian communion in recent cases. The General Assembly has interpreted the Westminster Confession by so-called logical deduction, and has condemned two ministers for heresy for teaching contrary to such pretended logical deductions. Professor Henry P. Smith made the point that his teaching complained of was prior to the definition of the General Assembly of such pretended logical deduction, and that, as applied to him, it was *ex post facto;* but the General Assembly decided against him. It is claimed that the decisions of the General Assembly in the Smith and Briggs cases are as obligatory as the Confession itself. It is altogether probable that other supreme judicatories would take the same large view of their powers, by majority vote should party lines be drawn. Majorities in party strife always break through legal forms and constitutional barriers.

Does subscription bind a man in his private opinions as well as in his official utterances? Is he obliged to teach the whole Confession, or may he avoid such parts of it as he doubts or misbelieves? Must he adhere to their forms of statement, or only use them in substance in other forms of statement? Is he simply restrained from teaching anything that contradicts the Confession and allowed liberty in other respects, as to speech on the one hand and silence on the other? Anthony Tuckney, one of the chief authors of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, writes to Whichcote that the Westminster Confession was designed as a public confession: "In the Assembly, I gave my vote with others that the Confession of Faith put out by authority should not be either required to be sworn or subscribed to, we having been burnt on the hand in that kind before, but so as not to be publicly preached or written against."[1] But in the practice of Presbyterian Churches the views of the Westminster divines have not been followed. In other ecclesiastical bodies there has been no final determination of

[1] *Eight Letters of Dr. Antony Tuckney* and *Dr. Benjamin Whichcote*, 1753; see also Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 200 f.

these questions. The stricter view has been ordinarily followed by the judicatories.

Does the Creed or Article of Faith fix the Faith of the Church so that there shall be no further development? Does it mean that there is to be no further development in the Faith of the Church, either in substance or mode of statement? Certainly no body which constructed confessions ever thought so. Either the Church has a sacred deposit which it cannot decrease or diminish, or its doctrine is capable of development. If it has a sacred deposit, no ecclesiastical body has any authority to change that deposit by introducing new doctrines into the area of definition. But who shall define that deposit? Has it ever been defined? What authority has the Church of the third century to define this deposit, which is not also in the Church of the twentieth century? If the Apostles' Creed defines that deposit, what authority is there in the more elaborate statements of the Nicene Creed? What authority had the later Church to enlarge the original Nicene Creed? If the Church could go on enlarging its Creed through the third and fourth centuries, why not in the centuries since the fourth? The Roman Church claims that the Council of Trent made a further definition of the original deposit. But when we have gone as far as this, then the deposit is simply the original germ out of which the whole immense system of ecclesiastical dogma and ritual has developed. You have, then, virtually abandoned the theory of an original deposit altogether, and recognised that the Faith of Christ's Church is a development from an original germ or germs of doctrine. The form changes, but the substance is eternal. If the Faith of the Church is capable of development, then we must hold either that the ecclesiastical body which constructed the Creed or Articles of Faith attained the goal of the development of the Church, or else that the development continues, and a later body has the same right to define dogmas as the earlier body. Any ecclesiastical body, therefore, which proposes to define the Faith of the Church, and check the further

expansion of it, arrogates to itself an authority over both the past and the future; it assumes to improve upon the definition of the past, and asserts that no improvement can be made on its own definitions.

Is the interpretation of Creeds and Confessions to be regarded as fixed or as variable? If you say variable, there must be such limitation to variability as will forbid inconsistency between the statements and the interpretations. A judicatory, on the one hand, cannot vary the interpretations so as to evacuate the statement of its original meaning and give it a new and different meaning. No more can an individual. But where there are variant interpretations in the way of logical deductions, all such must be regarded as legitimate. It is improper for the supreme judicatory to make the Creed more rigid by limiting its interpretation to specific deductions, when other deductions are historically legitimate. Confessions are, in the larger part of their statements, compromises framed to admit of more than one interpretation.

If, on the other hand, we say interpretation is fixed, where shall we fix the fixture? Shall we find it in the traditional interpretation? This is the easiest and therefore the common method in Protestantism. But tradition is the reverse of fixed. A traditional interpretation is continually changing, adapting the statement to new cases, or to new forms of old cases, depressing one statement, enhancing another statement, and so entirely changing the proportions and relations of the original definitions. The traditional interpretation usually does not give the original meaning. Shall we find it in the opinions of the supreme judicatory? These will be essentially the same as the traditional, for the simple reason that the majority of ecclesiastical bodies is always controlled by traditional opinions. The Roman Catholic principle is to seek it in the Fathers of the Church. This is far safer than the traditional principle which has prevailed in modern Protestantism, only it is still indefinite. One asks, which Fathers? And who shall interpret the Fathers?

You may misinterpret them by your traditions with greater ease than you can the Creeds or Articles of Faith. The only safe principle is the historic one—to interpret the Symbols of Faith by the intention of their authors.

The denominations have unconsciously drifted from their Confessions into traditional opinions which envelop the Confessions and the Creeds, and are the Faith of the Church to them, and it cannot be otherwise. We are all hurried along in the tide of opinion of our age, and our environment controls our opinions and practice. The majority simply drift. If they are in the stream of tradition, that is to them the evidence of antiquity. They little know how far the stream has carried them from their fathers. No man can really know whether he truly subscribes to any Creed or Confession until he has studied the writings of the men who composed it, and has investigated its sources and the mode of its construction. It matters little what our Creed or Confession may be, if the supreme judicatory may read into it anything it pleases. There is nothing gained by giving up the Westminster Confession and the Articles of Religion, and falling back on the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed, unless at the same time we may restrict the interpretation of that Creed to its original historic sense, to be determined by a court of historical scholars, and not by a General Assembly or a House of Bishops composed of all sorts and conditions of men.

It was a very important step toward Church Unity when the Chicago-Lambeth Declaration limited the faith of the reunited Church to the Holy Scriptures, the Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed; but it is necessary to know whether the Creeds are to be interpreted so as to comprehend the unfolding of their meaning in the decisions of the four great Councils of the undivided Church, in the Te Deum, in the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles of Religion. It is necessary to first fix the Creeds and know whether we are to subscribe to them in their original historical form, or in their later Roman and Anglican adaptations, before we can

agree upon a fixed interpretation of these Creeds. It is necessary to know whether, when we accept the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, we must accept with them antiquated interpretations of prophecy and old-fashioned explanations of the Gospel mysteries. The essence of the whole question as to Creeds and Confessions is in the terms of subscription.

The Christians of America will hardly agree to the doctrinal basis of the Chicago-Lambeth declarations until they know whether the jurisdiction of the Episcopate is to be limited to these articles, or whether these articles are simply doors through which they may enter, to find themselves subject to any doctrinal deduction the bishops may make from them. The jurisdiction of the supreme judicatory in which Church Unity is reached, should be strictly limited in matters of doctrine, not only to the Creeds, but to the express statements of the Creeds in their original form; and not only this, but to those express statements as interpreted, not by the judicatory itself, but by the historic interpretation of the authors of the Creeds, to be ascertained by historical scholars. In our acceptance of Holy Scripture as the Word of God, we do not relinquish our right as scholars to study them with all the help of modern Criticism. We do not propose to relinquish the freedom of scholarship either to the timidity of the ignorant or to the policy of time-serving ecclesiasticism. The cause of God will prosper much better in a divided Church, where freedom of historic research and Biblical Criticism prevails, than in a reunited Church in which a supreme ecclesiastical court may, by a majority vote of mere traditionalists, attempt to fix the interpretation of Scriptures and Creeds and other historical documents. We have one such supreme judicatory in Rome, guarded by venerable Canon Law, and independent of civil, social, provincial and ecclesiastical influences, that has over and over again lost the confidence of the world by its unjust and iniquitous decisions. Christendom desires no other, and will have no other, unless its powers may be so restricted by a

constitution that it may be altogether impartial, just and true in its decisions.

There are some who will continue to cling to the Westminster Confession; others to the decrees of the Council of Trent; others to the Heidelberg Catechism, and others to Luther's Catechism. Let them retain their darlings and organise themselves in presbyteries and councils, and such other ecclesiastical bodies as they may prefer, in order to conserve their beloved opinions. What we need, in order to attain Church Unity, is that they shall unite with all other Christians in a supreme jurisdiction, which shall be so limited that it will not, on the one hand, restrict the freedom to retain and advocate those confessions and catechisms, or any other statements of doctrine which may be framed; nor, on the other hand, impose upon subordinate jurisdictions anything more than the original historical interpretation of the express statements of the Creed adopted by all.

2. *Morals*

The Chicago-Lambeth Declaration of Unity does not reserve to the reunited Church any right of jurisdiction in matters of morals. Is it proposed that matters of morals shall be outside of the sphere of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or that these matters shall belong to the jurisdiction of the lower judicatories? It certainly cannot be designed that all matters of morals shall be regarded as outside the range of ecclesiastical jurisdiction on the one hand, or, on the other, that the jurisdiction of the supreme judicatory shall be unlimited in these matters. The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, the bases of the instruction of the Church and incorporated with the Creeds in all the Liturgies, seem to have been overlooked by the bishops; but I think that they were quite right. Morals are not for the decision of the supreme judicatory, but for the lower judicatories. Rome claims for the Pope the authority to speak the infallible decision when he is summoned to judgment *ex*

cathedra in matters of doctrine and morals. But the voice of Protestantism should reserve morals to the conscience of the individual and the jurisdiction of lower ecclesiastical courts.

Let us take into consideration three moral questions as specimens—Divorce, Sabbath Observance and Temperance. These questions belong to the State as well as to the Church. There is concurrent jurisdiction here of civil courts and ecclesiastical courts. Here is danger of collision in which the ecclesiastical court will surely be worsted. The Roman Church takes a decided position against divorce, but it cannot prevent laws by the States granting divorces which Rome refuses to recognise. The Westminster Confession contains a chapter on marriage and divorce. More than one minister has been suspended or deposed, for marriage to a deceased wife's sister; and yet the supposed prohibition in Levitical law is a misinterpretation; and even if it were a Levitical law, Levitical marriage laws are no more binding on the Church of Christ than the Levitical prohibitions of wearing mixtures of wool and linen, or ploughing with an ox and an ass harnessed together. Most Protestant denominations have removed this erroneous restriction, although Anglican bishops still persist in opposing such marriage, even after the repeal of the law by Parliament. The right of marriage and divorce is determined by the laws of the State. The Church should beware of conflicting legislation. There can be no reunion of Christendom, unless Christians, with different views of marriage and divorce, may freely organise themselves under the jurisdiction of lower judicatories, that will recognise their views of marriage and divorce, and that will guard them from the intrusion of conflicting opinions.

It is impossible to unite in the matter of Sabbath observance. The Puritan view is very different from the Anglican, the Lutheran and the Roman. The Puritan cannot force his opinion on the rest of the world. The only thing the Puritan can do is to keep the Sabbath in his own way, and organise societies for Sabbath observance after his ideals.

He cannot make the Puritan theory of the Sabbath the law for the United States, still less for the Christian world.

It is impossible to unite in matters of Temperance. The Methodist will hardly compel all others to his views of total abstinence so as to make it a matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The only thing that can be done is for those who believe in total abstinence to organise societies for that purpose. Those ecclesiastical bodies which bind the ministry and people to this theory sin grievously against Church Unity.

We might illustrate by other matters, but these are sufficient to show that jurisdiction in morals must be strictly limited. The supreme judicatory should not have any jurisdiction in morals. The original jurisdiction belongs to the congregation in case of a layman, and to the presbytery or diocesan in case of a minister. We have to distinguish between crime, vice and sin. Crime and vice are in the province of courts of original jurisdiction, and there should be appellate courts to correct errors in law. But questions of morals ought not to go to the supreme judicatories. It is most important to guard the conscience of the individual and the freedom of Christian love. Ecclesiastical decisions in morals tend to legalism, and legalism to a Pharisaism which is essentially Antichristian.

III. JURISDICTION OF PERSONS

The most important and practical side of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is jurisdiction over persons. The Roman Church claims universal jurisdiction over persons. The national Churches of Protestantism claimed universal jurisdiction over persons within the nation. All the persecution and intolerance of ancient and modern times originated from this claim. In the United States, and in Europe to a great extent at present, it is commonly agreed that the jurisdiction of a Church is limited to the persons who voluntarily adhere to it. After this limitation has been made, questions arise which are of great importance with reference to Church Unity.

The most comprehensive question is, Is the jurisdiction of the Church over persons total or partial? We should recognise that it is partial and not total. The jurisdiction of a Church over a person should be limited to the subject-matter of jurisdiction; it should not intrude upon his liberty in other matters. The Church should not intrude upon his civil rights and duties. The Church should not intrude upon his social and domestic relations. It should not interfere with his military service, with his club life, with his relations to secret societies, with his amusements or with his business, or with any one of a thousand matters in which he may engage, unless he transgress the lines of jurisdiction which the Church has reserved to itself. It is well known that the existing organisations intrude upon all of these relations. The Roman Catholics and the Reformed Presbyterians intrude upon civil duties. The Roman Catholics and the United Presbyterians intrude upon secret societies. The Methodists and Puritans intrude upon domestic affairs and amusements. All such intrusion, and any other like intrusion, beyond the lines of the limited subject-matter of superior and supreme jurisdiction, must be debarred if there is to be Church Unity. If a man or a minister assume vows which subject him to more extensive jurisdiction, it should be in inferior judicatories. The judicatories in which the unity of the Church is fixed should not intrude in these matters.

The jurisdiction over persons should not be everlasting. A man or a woman may assume strict vows of obedience in a very extensive jurisdiction, and should be held to these vows so long as either remains under that inferior judicatory. But no man or woman should assume lifelong vows. There should be freedom to separate from one inferior judicatory and to unite with another whenever it seem best to do so, provided pecuniary and personal engagements are filled, and the separation is made in an honourable, upright and courteous manner. Irrevocable vows are inconsistent with personal liberty and with Church Unity as well. There are

many evils in the Church, both for laymen and ministers, which result from irrevocable vows. They are an inheritance of Mediævalism. If a layman has made a mistake in his ecclesiastical connection, he should be free to correct that mistake without excommunication or lesser forms of ecclesiastical discipline. If a minister has made a mistake and has changed his opinions, he ought to be free to change his ecclesiastical relations without degradation. There cannot be Church Unity until such changes are recognised as lawful and proper.

The question now arises how far ecclesiastical jurisdiction is exclusive of other jurisdiction. Before the Reformation the clergy were under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Church. But, in the modern States, the Church and the State have concurrent jurisdiction over persons each in its own sphere. In the Roman Catholic Church there are jurisdictions of monastic orders which are distinct from the jurisdiction of the diocesan. In Protestant Churches ministers submit themselves freely to other jurisdictions than those of the Church and the State in relations which do not conflict with civil and ecclesiastical duties. A man may give an inferior jurisdiction the exclusive authority over him, but few men will in these times assume such vows of submission. The judicatories in which unity is to be found certainly cannot be so exclusive.

The question comes next whether it is necessary that a man should be under only one jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs. This is the common opinion, but there are numerous exceptions. A Presbyterian minister may be a member of a Congregational Church, and so subject to the jurisdiction of a presbytery of the Presbyterian denomination, and at the same time to a congregation of the Congregational denomination. He might be in good standing in the one and at the same time heretical in the other. There is no law to prevent a Presbyterian minister from remaining a Presbyterian minister and yet at the same time becoming a member of the Protestant Episcopal congregation by accepting

confirmation. It is possible, as things now are, for a minister to be in three or more denominations at the same time. Why not? It is quite true that complications might arise; but, on the other hand, great benefits might be conferred. There are many cases in which it would be of advantage to ministers and laymen to be in two or more ecclesiastical jurisdictions at the same time. My father served as trustee of three congregations in three different denominations at the same time. He fulfilled his duties in all, and was repeatedly re-elected in them all. If it was practicable in the management of the temporal affairs of the congregation, why not in the spiritual? It is quite as easy for a man to serve as elder or deacon or vestryman in three congregations as to serve as trustee. There are numerous instances in which men of influence reside part of the year in the city and part of the year in the country. In the city they worship in one denomination, in the country in another. They fulfil all their religious duties equally in both. Why should they not be enrolled as members and serve as church officers in both? Ministers are often called upon to minister, on the frontier, to two or more congregations of the same denomination; why not to two or more congregations of different denominations? There are thousands of communities in which there are three or more congregations of different denominations, each with a separate building, with occasional ministrations of ministers of its own denomination. It would be a boon if they could worship in the same building under the same minister. He might be a minister of three or more different judicatories. He might minister as an Episcopalian in the morning, as a Presbyterian or Congregationalist in the afternoon, and a Methodist in the evening. Why not? Many could do it and would do it if the way were open in the lower judicatories. One of the greatest of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church had that idea, but circumstances have prevented its realisation thus far. Thousands of ministers and millions of dollars could be spared if we could have this kind of Church Unity. It would be a

delight to many if they could be lawful ministers of several different denominations at the same time. Such would constitute a living bridge between the denominations.

It is commonly held that an ordained minister has authority to minister anywhere in the Church of God. It is maintained that the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church are not only diocesans, but bishops in the Church of God. These positions are untenable. It is quite true that there can be but one ordination to the priesthood according to the Roman doctrine. But admission to the order of priesthood does not carry with it authority for a world-wide ministry. The priest is ordained to minister in a particular diocese and ordinarily over a particular congregation. He cannot act as priest in any other diocese without the consent of the diocesan. He cannot be a free lance in the world. He can only act under the appointment of his superiors. A bishop is ordained over a diocese, but he cannot act as a bishop in any other diocese without the appointment of his metropolitan, or the invitation of another diocesan. He may act in council when summoned to the council, but even in council he acts as the head of his diocese, not as a universal bishop. According to the Roman œcumenical ecclesiastical organisation, the world is mapped out into patriarchates, archdioceses, dioceses and missionary jurisdictions. But those who minister in missionary lands are subject to diocesan authority, and are within the territorial and comprehensive dominion of the Roman Church. From the point of view of one holy catholic œcumenical Church, ordination constitutes a priest or a bishop in a universal Church; he cannot be reordained, but he cannot minister in any particular place without appointment by his diocesan, and he cannot remove without authority.

The situation becomes very much changed when we recognise more than one valid ecclesiastical organisation. The Church of England has no ecclesiastical authority in any other land than England, save so far as she conducts missionary work. When she cut herself off from œcumenical

relations, she lost the authority to give her ministry œcumenical relations, or to constitute her bishops any other than bishops of the Church of England. She could not communicate any more authority than she had, and that authority was limited to England. So soon as the authority of the Church of England was still further limited and restricted to her voluntary adherents, she could not impart to her ministry or her bishops any authority beyond the persons who voluntarily adhere to the Church of England. The Church of England became more and more limited in her jurisdiction and the authority of her ministry, with every separating of dissenters, until at the present time it is doubtful whether she has authority over one-half of the English people. Under these circumstances it is no longer possible to think of Anglican bishops and Anglican priests as having any authority beyond that committed to them over the persons who adhere to them. No Anglican bishop can exercise jurisdiction in any particular over any company of Roman Catholics, or Presbyterians, or Congregationalists, or Baptists, or Methodists, or Unitarians, or Friends, or any others, except Episcopalians. He cannot convey by his ordination any authority to any person to minister over any congregation except congregations adhering to the Church of England. The same thing is true of every denomination of Christians. No denomination has the slightest authority, or the least shadow of a jurisdiction, beyond its own voluntary adherents. No ministers have any other external authority in the Church than that committed to them by the ecclesiastical organisations to which they voluntarily adhere. Some are Episcopal ministers, others are Congregational, others Presbyterian, Baptist, or Reformed. No one of them can act as a minister in any other denomination without receiving authority from some jurisdiction in that denomination so to act. They are ministers of Christ by Christ's appointment, but none of them has any universal ministry, and they cannot have such ministry in the present divided state of Christendom until they have received au-

thority and submitted to the jurisdiction of all valid existing ecclesiastical organisations.

It is intolerable to suppose that any ecclesiastical body, in the present divided state of the Church, can make or unmake Christian ministers for the whole world. Their making and unmaking will be recognised by no other body but themselves. The ministry are deceiving themselves in supposing that the separated denominations have made them ministers of the one undivided Church. They cannot do this so long as they remain divided. When the separated Churches have become one undivided Church, then and not until then will a denominational ministry become a Catholic ministry.

The Protestant Episcopal bishops are no more than diocesan bishops. They have no other Episcopal authority than that imparted to them at their ordination. They are bound to act under the Canon Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is not in accordance with ecclesiastical law, and it is not safe, to attribute to them any other authority, any other prerogative. They have no jurisdiction outside of their diocese except so far as they may be invited to exercise jurisdiction temporarily by other diocesan authority. If they act as bishops outside of their denomination, they act without authority, unless they receive additional authority so to act from a body of ministers competent to select them as their diocesans.

Suppose that a number of ministers of different denominations should organise themselves into a body of ministry, and request a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church to act as their diocesan, and he should agree to do so, and they by the imposition of their hands should communicate to one another all the ministerial authority they could communicate—what would they communicate and what would be the result? No one of them could have any ecclesiastical authority to act outside of the ecclesiastical organisation to which he belonged. They could not, therefore, communicate any authority whatever from their ecclesiastical organisations.

The only authority they could communicate would be that which they possess by the internal call received by each of them from Jesus Christ. They would simply constitute a new denomination of Christians without transmitting any authority whatever from any existing denominations. This is the precise position in which Ballington Booth, Commander of the Volunteers, has been placed by his supposed ordination by ministers from several different denominations. These ministers disclaimed acting with the authority of their denominations behind them. Therefore they disclaimed all ecclesiastical authority. The ordination was without the authority of any body of Christians. No authority was imparted by any Church. The ordination was a mere ceremony; it can only be regarded as null and void.

The reunion of Christendom depends upon these questions of jurisdiction more than upon any other questions. We have studied some of the difficulties in the way. We have examined some of the solutions of them which seem practicable. Church Unity is such an inestimable boon that many are willing to make great sacrifices for its attainment. But it is necessary for us to know what we are about and to avoid compromising blunders. Roman Catholics and Anglicans, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and other religious bodies, have, through their supreme judicatories, spoken words of reconciliation and expressed the desire for the Reunion of Christendom. We may be sure, therefore, that there is a world-wide movement in the direction of Church Unity, and that all the difficulties which lie in the way will be carefully studied and eventually removed. It may seem like a dream to many. But it is really a constant feature in the vision of Biblical prophecy. It was the ideal of Jesus, and we may be certain that the ideal will eventually be transformed into reality.

VII

THE REAL AND THE IDEAL IN THE PAPACY

THE Papacy is one of the greatest institutions that have ever existed in the world; it is much the greatest now existing, and it looks forward with calm assurance to a still greater future. Its dominion extends throughout the world over the only œcumenical Church. All other Churches are national or provincial in their organisation. It reaches back in unbroken succession through more than eighteen centuries to St. Peter, appointed by the Saviour of the world to be the Primate of the Apostles. It commands the great central body of Christianity, which has ever remained the same organism since apostolic times. All other Christian organisations, however separate they may be from the parent stock, have their share in the Papacy as a part of the Christian heritage and are regarded by the Papacy as subject to its jurisdiction. The authority of the Papacy is recognised as supreme in all ecclesiastical affairs, by the most compact and best-organised body of mankind, and as infallible in determination of doctrines of faith and morals when it speaks *ex cathedra.*

The history of the Papacy has been a history of storm and conflict. About it have raged for centuries the greatest battles in all history. The gates of hell have been open in Rome, if anywhere in this world. At times it seemed as if hell had emptied itself in Rome, and, to use the language of the Apocalypse, it was become "a habitation of devils and a hold of every unclean spirit."[1] It is not strange that zealous Protestants, when they looked at the abominations that enveloped the Papacy in their times, saw in it the

[1] Rev. xviii, 2.

"woman sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy," and regarded it as "the mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth."[1] And yet these forces of evil have always been driven back. When the conflict has subsided, the Papacy has stood forth stronger than ever. If zealous Protestants, in their antipathy to the Papacy, picture it in all the imagery of the Biblical Anti-Christ, can we blame the defenders of the Papacy from applying to it the words of Jesus to St. Peter? Is there not historic truth in saying, "The gates of hell have not prevailed against it"? Are not the words of Jesus to St. Peter equally appropriate to his successors?—"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat, but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."[2]

I. BIBLICAL BASIS

The Papacy has a much firmer basis in a number of texts of the New Testament and in Christian history than most Protestants have been willing to recognise. There can be no doubt that Roman Catholic controversialists have warped the meaning of several passages of the New Testament in the interest of the most exaggerated claims for the Papacy. But, on the other hand, Protestant controversialists have minimised the importance of these texts and emptied them of their true meaning. Jesus, in his vision of his Kingdom, when St. Peter recognised him as the Messiah, said:

"Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonah,
For flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee,
But my Father which is in heaven;
And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter,
And upon this rock will I build my church (house),
And the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.
I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of God.
And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,
And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."
(Matt. xvi, 17–19.)

[1] Rev. xvii, 3–5.

[2] Luke xxii, 31, 32.

All attempts to explain the "rock" in any other way than as referring to Peter have ignominiously failed.[1] As I have said elsewhere:

St. Peter was thus made by the appointment of Jesus the rock on which the Church was built as a spiritual house, or temple; and at the same time the porter of the kingdom, whose privilege it is to open and shut its gates. The Church is here conceived as a building, a house, constituted of living stones, all built upon Peter, the first of these stones, or the primary rock foundation. It is also conceived as a city of God, into which men enter by the gates. These conceptions are familiar in the Old Testament, as well as in the New Testament. The significant thing here is the primacy of St. Peter. He is chief of the Twelve, who elsewhere in the New Testament are conceived as the twelve foundations of the temple and city of God. He is the chief porter, as elsewhere the Twelve have the authority of the keys, and the Church has it, as an assembly of Christians. Jesus gave them authority to admit into his kingdom, or to exclude therefrom. (*Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 277.)

This saying of Jesus is confirmed by the history of the apostolic age. Peter was certainly the chief of the apostles, according to all the Gospels, during the earthly life of our Lord. The early chapters of Acts represent him as the acknowledged chief of the apostolic community down to the Council at Jerusalem. If we had the continuation of the narrative of St. Peter's work in Antioch, Western Asia and finally in Rome, in all probability the same undisputed leadership would appear. But the last half of the book of Acts follows the career of St. Paul, based on the narrative of one of his companions, probably Titus, and naturally St. Paul is the hero of that narrative. Furthermore, St. Paul's work is illustrated by his Epistles, which assume a most prominent position in the New Testament. It is very common among those who follow the Lutheran tradition, which makes the Epistle to the Galatians the test of the genuine theology of St. Paul and the key to Apostolic Christianity, to depreciate St. Peter in comparison with St. Paul. But, in fact, the Council of Jerusalem decided for St. Peter, and St. Paul himself abandoned his earlier unflinching adherence

[1] See Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 190.

to theory in favor of the Christian expediency of St. Peter, in all of his subsequent life, as is evident from his own later Epistles and from the story of the companion of his travels. It has been established by modern Historic Criticism that the Church of the second century did not build on St. Paul, but rather on the Gospels and, presumably, on St. Peter. Harnack puts it in the form of an Irish bull when he says: "Only one Gentile Christian, Marcion, understood St. Paul, and he misunderstood him."[1]

It is evident that Jesus, in speaking to St. Peter, had the whole history of his Kingdom in view. He sees conflict with the evil powers and victory over them. It is, therefore, vain to suppose that we must limit the commission to St. Peter. We could no more do that than we could limit the apostolic commission to the apostles. The commission of the primate, no less than the commission of the Twelve, includes their successors in all time to the end of the world. The natural interpretation of the passage, apart from all prejudice, gives the Papacy a basal authority, as it has always maintained. Therefore, we must admit that there must be a sense in which the successors of St. Peter are the rock of the Church, and have the authority of the keys in ecclesiastical government, discipline and determination of faith and morals. Inasmuch, however, as the commission is given to the Twelve and their successors also as to the power of the keys, it is necessary to take the several passages together, and conclude that the authority was given to the apostles in a body by our Lord, and that it was given to St. Peter as the executive head of the body.

There are two other passages upon which the Papacy builds its authority. The chief of these is John xxi., where Peter is singled out from the seven, who were with Jesus on the shore of the Sea of Galilee after his resurrection, and the command was given to Peter to feed the sheep. Here Jesus appoints St. Peter to be the shepherd of the flock of Christ, which, in accordance with the usage of the time with

[1] *Dogmengeschichte* (1886), I, p. 62.

reference to the kings of David's line, and with reference to Christ himself as the good Shepherd, implies government of the Church. It is all the more significant that this passage singles out and distinguishes Peter in the presence of the sons of Zebedee and others, the most prominent of the Twelve, and that the narrative is contained in the Gospel of John. Here, again, it cannot be supposed that this is a commission to St. Peter as an individual. He is given an office as the chief shepherd of the flock of Christ. If the flock continues, the chief shepherd must be the successor of St. Peter, to carry on his work as shepherd. The third passage is given in Luke xxii. 31, 32. None of these passages is in the Gospel of Mark, which represents the preaching of St. Peter as nearly as we can come to it; but in the other three Gospels, Matthew from Palestine or Syria, John from Asia Minor, and Luke from a Roman disciple of St. Paul. They may well, therefore, represent the consensus of the Apostolic Church. These three words of Jesus to St. Peter were all uttered on the most solemn and critical occasions in the life of our Lord. They may all be regarded, therefore, as visions of our Lord, visions of his Kingdom and ideals of the Papacy.

II. HISTORIC RIGHT

I cannot undertake to give even a sketch of the history of the Papacy. We shall have to admit that the Christian Church from the earliest times recognised the primacy of the Roman bishop, and that all other great Sees at times recognised the supreme jurisdiction of Rome in matters of doctrine, government and discipline. It can easily be shown that the assumptions of the bishops of Rome were often resented, their intrusions into the rights of other patriarchates, provinces and dioceses were often resisted, their decisions were often refused; but when the whole case has been carefully examined and all the evidences sifted, the statement of Irenæus stands firm:

> Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the Churches, we do put to confusion

all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorised meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church, founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our times by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church on account of its pre-eminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere. (*Adv. Hær.* III, 3:2.)

The historical development of the Papacy is one of the most stupendous series of events in history. Throughout the greater part of its history, until the Reformation, the Papacy represented the cause of the Christian people against emperor, kings and princelets. It was the saviour of Christian civilisation from heathen barbarism. But toward the close of the Middle Ages, owing to its entanglement with political affairs and the exaggeration of its civil interests over against its ecclesiastical, the Papacy so stretched its prerogatives as to become a peril to the States of Europe, where absolutism had to be resisted at all costs in the interests of humanity and even of Christianity itself. After many ineffectual attempts to reform the Papacy by Christian Councils and movements of various kinds that had resulted in wide-spread and wellnigh universal dissatisfaction, Luther applied the match, and Europe was aflame in resistance to the unholy despotism of the Popes. Few, if any, thought of overthrowing the jurisdiction of the Papacy in ecclesiastical affairs, but they were determined to rid themselves of its despotism in all other affairs. But the inevitable result of the conflict was the repudiation by Protestantism of the jurisdiction of the Pope altogether. It was found that the ecclesiastical and the civil were so inextricably interwoven, at the time, that the whole fabric had to be cast off.

The Protestant Reformation was essentially a Protest, and so it might always have remained, a protest against Papal

usurpation, with a willingness to recognise all valid, historical and Biblical rights of the Pope. But, by the irresistible force of circumstances, Protestantism was compelled to go further and organise itself in national Churches, entirely apart from any jurisdiction of the Pope. So far as there was a historical necessity for this course, it was valid. But when, later, Protestants went so far as to deny all the historic rights of the Papacy, Protestantism put itself in a false position which must ultimately be abandoned. In the meanwhile the Papacy has been obliged gradually to reform itself. The Council of Trent was a reforming Council, and there has been a slow, cautious, but steady advance in reform ever since. Catholics and Protestants all over the world are looking with hope and eagerness for great and wide-spread reforms, such as may remove the evils that brought about the division of the Church, and destroy the barriers which perpetuate the separation, and in a spirit of love and concord rally the entire Christian world about Christ our Lord, and a successor of St. Peter who will be as near to Christ as St. Peter was, and as truly a representative of the Lord and Master as Shepherd of the flock of Christ, the executive head of a re-united Christianity. Is there in the Papacy as at present constituted any hope for the future? Can we see any prospects for such reforms as are necessary to reunion?

III. PRIMACY OF THE POPE

(1) The unity of the Church is in Christ, the head of the entire body of Christians. Such a Christianity embraces the world of the living and the dead, those in various stages of preparation, as well as those already Christian. Christianity in the world is organised in one Church, under the Apostolic ministry, culminating in the universal Bishop, the successor of St. Peter. The three constituents necessary to complete unity are the Pope, the ministry and the people, a threefold cord which should not be broken. The unity of the Church is not in the person of the Pope, but in his office, as the uni-

versal bishop, and as such the head of all the bishops, as these are of the ministers and people. In Christian history, the unity of the ministry has been expressed in Œcumenical Councils, that of the people in their lawful civil governments. Any failure to recognise and give due weight to each and all of these constituents of unity impairs the unity of the Church, but does not destroy it, so long as even one of the lines remains unbroken.

(2) The Pope, as the successor of St. Peter, is the executive head of the Church. But that which is essential to his office and the exercise of its functions should be distinguished from what is unessential and unnecessary. The Primacy is independent of national or circumstantial relations. It is not necessary that the successor of St. Peter should be Italian or Roman. St. Peter was not a Roman, but a Jew of Palestine. The Popes have been, in fact, chiefly Roman or Italian, except for the periods of the supremacy of the German Empire, when there was a series of German Popes, and the supremacy of France and the residence of the Popes at Avignon, when there was a series of French Popes. This is a provincialisation or nationalisation of the Papacy, and is a serious hindrance to its universality. However important it may be, for historical reasons, that the successor of St. Peter should have his seat in Rome, it is not essential. St. Peter was primate before he went to Rome. His residence in Rome was brief, and there is no evidence that he would have remained permanently in Rome if he had lived. The residence of the Popes at Avignon for a long period makes this position necessary, otherwise the succession would be broken. It is not essential that the successor of St. Peter should be bishop of Rome. There is no sufficient evidence that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, or that Rome had a bishop in apostolic times. The combination of a universal episcopate with a diocesan episcopate, however necessary in early times, has been productive of a multitude of evils. The Roman people have ever made claims in their choice of their own bishops which, while entirely appropriate to a diocesan

bishop, cannot be recognised as valid to a universal bishop, and have been intolerable to other cities and nations. The interests of the city of Rome have ever been exaggerated at the expense of other cities and nations. This has tended to make the Papacy metropolitan and provincial, rather than universal. The efforts of the great Popes to do justice to their universal episcopate have kept them in constant strife with Rome and Italy until the present day. If in some way the office of the primate could be separated from diocesan, provincial and national episcopates and limited to œcumenical duties, a multitude of evils would be overcome.

(3) The primacy of the Pope does not depend upon any particular theory as to the extent of his jurisdiction. This has varied from age to age. The theory of the primacy of the Pope which prevailed in the ancient Catholic Church must be regarded as sufficient to maintain the unity of the Church in the Papacy, otherwise this unity did not then exist and cannot be derived by succession from the apostles. The theory of the Papacy which now prevails in the Roman Catholic Church may be regarded as a development of the original definition of the primacy, but cannot be regarded as essential to its existence. Those who hold to the primacy of the Pope in the ancient Catholic sense cannot be regarded as violating the unity of the Church in the Papacy, because they refuse to regard this late development as valid. If the Papacy of to-day makes it impossible for them to take part actively in this unity, the Papacy itself is to blame.

The primacy of the Pope was recognised in the ancient Catholic Church, even by Churches which were compelled to separate from Rome by unrighteous and intolerable tyranny of the Popes. The chief fault was with the Popes, who strained the lines of jurisdiction so far that they broke. If these faults of Rome should ever be reduced to a minimum, there is no sufficient reason why the separation should continue because of ancient faults. The slender thread of a recognised primacy, latent and inoperative, is still sufficient to maintain the essential unity of the Church.

The primacy of the Pope was recognised by the Protestant Reformers, who appealed from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. They receded from the position only when expelled from the Roman Catholic Church, and when such a position became no longer practicable. Theoretically, Protestantism still remains Protestant, protesting against the excessive claims of the Papacy and willing to recognise its legitimate claims. When the jurisdiction of the Papacy is reduced to its normal dimensions, there will remain no sufficient reason for the separation of the Protestant Churches, provided other obstacles have been removed.

(4) The primacy of the Popes does not depend upon any particular theory as to the subject-matter of their jurisdiction. That has varied from time to time, and only the Catholic essentials can be rightly demanded. The claim of the Papacy to jurisdiction in civil affairs and to dominion over civic governments has been justly refused by the nations at the expense of many wars, and is no longer of any practical importance. Even in the mild forms of mediation for peace it has recently been rejected with unanimity by the nations at the Conference at the Hague. Such claims are against the express teaching of Jesus and his apostles, and the practice of the ancient Catholic Church.

The claims of the Papacy to a Papal domain in the former States of the Church and the city of Rome have been rejected by the people of those States and the city of Rome itself. Whatever historic necessity there may have been for so extensive a civil dominion in the past, at present such an extended civil jurisdiction is impracticable and of no real importance. The Papacy must have a territory in which it may carry on the government of the Church throughout the world outside the jurisdiction of any particular civil government. But a very limited territory, such as the American District of Columbia, would be amply sufficient for that purpose.

The claim of the Papacy to determine questions of civil government for Roman Catholic citizens is resisted by mod-

ern peoples, and must be eventually withdrawn. Whether the attempt is made to influence the governments by representatives of the Papacy, as in Austria and Spain, or by the organisation of Catholic parties for the maintenance of so-called Catholic principles, as in Germany, they intensify political strife by religious interests, they mix politics and religion, they provoke religious conflicts, and are demoralising to the Roman Catholic Church itself.

The sad results of such Papal interference are now disturbing the great French nation. Whatever faults there may have been on the part of the French government, it was, in fact, defending itself against Papal interference, and it is not surprising that the defence was at last transformed into an aggressive campaign, in the determination to get rid of the enemy once for all, and at all hazards. In such a conflict it is vain for the Papacy to assert the divine constitution of the Church, for that divine constitution has nothing whatever to do with civil jurisdiction or rights of property.

The claims of the Papacy to determine questions of Science and Philosophy, of Sociology and Economics, are resented and resisted by scholars and people interested in these matters. The Syllabus of Pius IX was just such an intrusion of Papal jurisdiction, which has injured the influence of the Roman Catholic Church to a very great extent and has been productive of great mischief. The issue of another Syllabus by Pius X is a reactionary policy, which greatly imperils the influence of the Papacy upon the present generation. The continual inscribing on the Index of many of the best works of modern scholars, even those of devout Roman Catholics, is resented by scholars of all faiths. The recent decisions of the Papal Commission, under the lead of incompetent divines, against the sure results of modern Biblical criticism, present clear evidence of the intolerance of modern Roman scholasticism.

The claims of the Popes to determine social questions, such as marriage and divorce and public education, in their civil relations, have been resisted in all free countries, and

have resulted in civil marriage and divorce, and in public schools without religious instruction. There can be no question of the right of the Pope to determine all ecclesiastical questions as regards marriage and divorce for Roman Catholic citizens, and to fortify ecclesiastical opinions by ecclesiastical penalties; or of the right of Roman Catholic citizens to organise parochial schools with religious instruction after their own mind; but any interference by the Pope directly or indirectly with such questions when under debate by modern governments cannot be less than a misuse of Papal jurisdiction.

(5) The jurisdiction of the Pope should be defined and limited by a constitution, as the executive office has been in all modern governments. The development of modern civil governments has been in the growth of constitutions, defining and limiting the power and jurisdiction of the executive. This was necessary in order to the removal of the evils of absolutism and tyranny. The same development is greatly needed in the Papacy for the same reasons. The Papacy is at present more absolute in its government than the Czar of Russia or the Sultan of Turkey. It can no more be allowed to the Popes to define their own powers and the subject-matter of their jurisdiction, than it can be allowed to modern monarchs. The history of the Papacy is a history of errors in this regard. The Popes have, in fact, claimed anything and everything they wished. Let them limit their jurisdiction to that which St. Peter exercised, and the world will have no quarrel with them. Constitutional definitions and restrictions are needed to restrain the Popes and their councillors, the cardinals, within their legitimate limits of jurisdiction; and also to defend the rights of the Papacy from the intrusion of civil governments. If the peril of former times was the excessive claims of the Popes, the peril at present is also the intrusion of the civil powers into ecclesiastical affairs. Such a constitution would protect the Pope in his rights as the executive head of the Church, and limit him only within his just sphere of jurisdiction.

The definition of the Vatican Council limits the sphere of the infallible authority of the Pope to faith and morals, and thereby declares fallible, though authoritative, his jurisdiction in all other matters. What is needed to make that definition more practical is to define not only the rights and liberties of the Church, but also the limits of that liberty, restraining the Church from interference with the States, and modern learning, and social and economical affairs; as well as restraining the States from interference with ecclesiastical affairs.

(6) The Primacy of the Pope is not apart from the apostolic ministry but in union with it. The Orientals hold to the Œcumenical Councils and their supremacy, and maintain their unity through them. The subjugation of Oriental Christianity, with the exception of Russia, by Mohammedanism, has rendered it impracticable for them to engage in General Councils in modern times. The Roman Catholic Church, after the separation of the Orientals, continued to hold Œcumenical Councils down to the present time, twenty-two in all; but inasmuch as these Councils were limited to bishops, doctors and heads of orders, in subjection to Rome, and they excluded, especially since the Protestant Reformation, the representatives of the majority of Christian and Orthodox Churches, they are not regarded as œcumenical, except by the Roman Catholic Church itself. Protestants demanded an Œcumenical Council to reform the Church and settle the great problems and controversies of Christianity. The Council of Trent, which excluded them and all others, except those who submitted to the Pope, they could not recognise as truly œcumenical. Protestantism still demands an Œcumenical Council; and, so far as is practicable through international alliances and conventions and assemblies of various denominations, is striving to realise it. Those Christian Churches which recognise the unity of the Church in Œcumenical Councils, adhere to those of the early Church, which were truly œcumenical, and long for such in the present time, to remove the distractions of Christianity, and hold to

this line of unity so far as practicable—they are not so much to blame for the perpetuation of discord in the Church as those who make such Councils impossible.

The Roman Catholic Church has reduced the bishops to submission under the absolute dominion of the Pope. The overruling of the councils of the episcopate of France on several recent occasions by the Pope, and their humble submission to his will, constitute one of the most melancholy situations in the history of Christianity. There is no other provision for a General Council of bishops than the desire, or need, of the Pope to convoke them. He alone determines the members of the Council, which in any case is composed largely of bishops without jurisdiction, entirely dependent upon himself for support. If they are not sufficiently submissive, their decisions may be overruled and reversed at his will. The Vatican Council abdicated the rights of Council in favour of the Pope. The Papacy thus deprived itself of the support of a Council at the very time when modern States, even Italy, found it necessary to establish and exalt the powers of representative bodies. A Council will not be called until needed to sustain the Pope. But it is evident that the Pope needs just such a Council and that he must call it erelong. It would not by any means injure the Primacy of the Pope if he were sustained by an episcopate meeting at regular intervals in a Council, as the Council of Constance prescribed. It would destroy his absolutism, which can only invoke passive obedience, but it would enhance his authority by giving it greatly needed support, and arouse the enthusiasm of the Church for greatly needed reforms. The Papacy should limit itself by a representative Council of Bishops, giving to such a body the legislative functions of the Church, and restricting the Papal authority to executive functions and the right of initiative and veto in legislative matters as in all modern civil governments. The usual objections made to such representative Councils are evidently insincere. They simply indicate the reluctance of Rome to have any check upon its will. The bishops are required to report to the

Pope every three or five years. It would be no more difficult to gather them at regular intervals of five years in Council. Other Christian Churches find no difficulty in assembling representatives from all parts of the world.

The Cardinalate is not a representative body, and can hardly be made one, because it is essentially engaged in the executive work of the Church, as the cabinets and officials of modern States. It is chiefly Italian, and largely Roman, and as such is influenced by Roman and Italian interests, often at the sacrifice of œcumenical relations. There is a strong feeling throughout the world, and even in Rome, that the Cardinalate should be a more representative body, less Italian and Roman. It is generally said that the present Pope will gradually bring this about. But he has done nothing thus far in this direction. The reluctance in Rome to appoint American cardinals, and the eager use of any and every excuse to avoid it, are striking evidences of the desire not to give the American Catholics their just share in the government of the Church and to keep them under the dominion of Rome. In view of the fact that the cardinals are diocesan bishops of the Roman province, presbyters of Roman Churches and deacons of the Roman diocese, they are too Roman to be œcumenical in office. Furthermore, the cardinals are really the cabinet of the Pope; and it is necessary that most of them should live in Rome in order to transact the business of the Church; therefore they cannot be truly representative of other nations.

In the Protestant world, the principle of representation is much further developed than in the Roman Catholic. The synods, diocesan, provincial, national and international, represent the ministry in most Protestant Churches. The representative principle has little influence at present in the Roman Catholic world. But there is no impediment to the full recognition of that principle and its practical efficient use, if the Papacy should so determine.

(7) The third line of unity is the consent of the Christian people. This consent has been recognised from the most

ancient times, but its practical operation has been suppressed by the hierarchy in the Roman Church. When the Roman Empire became Christian, the Emperor, as the supreme ruler of the Christian people, had a potent influence in determining ecclesiastical and doctrinal affairs in the West as well as in the East. The Emperor represented the Christian people, over against the clergy, and the people thereby had, in fact, an exaggerated influence in the Church. The right of the Emperor was inherited by the modern nations into which the Empire was divided, and passed over from king to princes, presidents, parliaments and congresses of the people. In all State Churches, the rights of the people centre in their sovereigns in all ecclesiastical affairs. In the free Churches, the consent of the people is expressed by their representatives sitting with the ministry in various representative assemblies.

The Roman Church has always recognised this great original Catholic principle of unity, and therefore insisted upon the union of Church and State. Centuries of struggle with the empire and the kings and States of Europe were necessary, because of the conflict between civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, in which the emperors and kings were more often at fault than even the Popes, who resisted to the utmost every restriction upon a jurisdiction which they were ever eager to enlarge. The battle of the Reformation resulted in the overthrow of the Papacy in the north of Europe, and in the elimination of the rights of the nations with regard to the affairs of the Church in southern Europe, by the establishment of Concordats.

A Concordat is something more than a commercial agreement. It is nonsense to say that a nation may not annul such an agreement without the consent of the Papacy. The Pope himself violated the laws of France adapting the Concordat to practical issues, by summoning two French bishops to Rome in spite of the prohibition of the French government. The ecclesiastical and the civil interests were irreconcilable at the time, and the Pope had to act in accordance with the spiritual interests of the Church. But if the Pope

may violate the Concordat, as interpreted by France, in the interests of spiritual religion, the French government may abrogate it in the interests of civil government. France could not recognise the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope in the matter of determining questions that arose under the Concordat. The separation of Church and State in Italy and France, leaves but two important Roman Catholic States, Austria and Spain, and these will doubtless soon follow the example of France. The fear of this result probably influences greatly the Papacy in its resistance to the present French government. This is probably the last desperate struggle of the Papacy for political power. Its inevitable defeat will reduce its political relations to a minimum. It will be an immeasurable blessing to the world when civil politics disappears from the Papacy altogether.

In much the greater part of the Roman Catholic world, the Popes have at present no means of determining the consent of the Christian people, except by their submission to the decisions of Rome made known through the episcopate. The Papacy has absorbed into itself the authority of Councils and of the peoples also, and so has become the most absolute despotism on earth. The future of the Papacy in the modern world depends upon the reinvigoration of the latent principle of the consent of the people through their representatives in some form of ecclesiastical Council. There are, here and there, signs of the beginning of some such movement, and there is no obstacle to it except the consent of the Papacy.

(8) The eventual reunion of Christendom depends upon the reinvigoration and harmonious working out of the three lines of unity as a threefold cord of invincible strength. So far as the Papacy is concerned, it should be constitutional, and should give adequate representation to the clergy and the people, meeting in Councils at regular intervals. The three great divisions of Christendom have only partial unity through the use of one only of the lines of unity. The Roman Church makes the Papacy the most essential principle of

unity, to the neglect of the Œcumenical Council and the consent of the Christian people, which remain latent principles. The Greeks make the principle of unity the Œcumenical Councils and the consent of the people in the Emperor, the real head of the Church; the executive principle of the Papacy is latent. The State Churches of Protestantism emphasise the consent of the people in the authority of kings, princes and legislative bodies. The Free Churches employ the consent of the people in representative bodies. There are no valid reasons why the Papacy in the future may not reinvigorate the Council by making it truly representative of the ministry and the people of the Christian world.

(9) In the most advanced modern States the government distinguishes three great functions—the executive, legislative and judicial—each having its own appropriate organisation. The executive function is exercised in monarchies by a king or emperor, in republics by a president. The legislative function is exercised by legislative bodies usually in two Houses, the one more directly representing the people, the other representing the nobility, or the more conservative interests. The judicial function is exercised by a bench of judges. In no Church has there been a sufficient discrimination in the development of these functions. All Churches alike are a long distance behind the civil governments in this matter. The Roman Catholic Church combines them all in the Papacy, just as in former ages they were combined in the Emperor. Protestant bodies combine all three functions: in Free Churches in national synods; in State Churches under various ecclesiastical authorities appointed by and subject to the State. The executive function is in the background even in Episcopal Churches. The judicial function is the one that is most neglected, and therefore it is always difficult to get a valid judicial decision upon any important question, whether of doctrine, government or discipline, in any of the Protestant Churches. There is no adequate training of the clergy in Canon Law, and they are therefore as a body altogether unfitted to sit as jurors or judges. The

transformation of Church government into full accord with modern Civil government would be a most important step toward the restoration of the full unity of the Church.

(10) There are no serious barriers in the way of such a transformation of the Papacy as may remove the chief objections of those Churches, which do not at present recognise its supreme jurisdiction. The great principle of unity of Greek and Oriental Churches may become operative in Œcumenical Councils truly representing the entire Christian world. Such Councils may by their decisions so supplement, enlarge and improve the past decisions of the Roman Catholic Church and Popes that the objections to them may be removed and the entire world may accept the results. The infallible and irreformable determinations of Councils and Popes are few, and these may be so explained, limited or enlarged; and the essential so discriminated from the unessential, that even these determinations may no longer be stumbling-blocks to the world. The great principle of Protestant Christianity, the consent of the Christian people, may become operative in the introduction of representatives of the people into the presbyterial and synodical system of the Church. The bureaucracy of the Cardinalate and the Congregations at Rome may be reduced to the efficient system in use in all modern representative governments. The absolutism of the Pope may be limited by a constitution defining carefully the limitations and extent of his powers. The government of the Pope may be fortified and at the same time limited by a Council, meeting every three or five years, representing the entire Christian world. The legislative function of the Papacy may be eliminated from the executive, as in the best modern States. The judicial function of the Papacy may be separated by the organisation of a supreme court of Christendom. There is nothing in any infallible decision of Councils and Popes that in any way prevents some such transformation of the Papacy as is here conceived of. This ideal may be in its details an illusion—doubtless most will think it such—but whether the outlines of this ideal and its details

be mistaken in whole or in part, it is certain, as Jesus Christ our Saviour reigns over his Church and the world, that some day, in some way, the Papacy will be reformed so as to correspond with his ideal, and will be so transformed as to make it the executive head of a universal Church.

VIII

INFALLIBILITY, TRUE AND FALSE

One of the most difficult questions that confront the student of Religion is the question of authority. It is a dangerous subject to discuss, because theologians and Churches are greatly divided about it, and they feel that their own personal and historic positions depend upon it. And yet the serious problems involved in it must be discussed, and their solutions sought, if there is to be any real progress in Theology, and a removal of the obstacles to the Reunion of Christendom. Some years ago I was condemned for heresy because I said, in an Inaugural Address,[1] that there were "three great fountains of divine Authority, the Bible, the Church and the Reason." I stated a simple fact recognised by all the older historical Churches, but one that was overlooked by my opponents, who thought, either that I was depreciating the authority of the Bible, or that I was unduly exalting the authority of the Church, or that I was exaggerating the authority of the Reason. There was no agreement among those who condemned me except that I was wrong. In that address I considered the questions of authority and certainty. I said nothing of infallibility further than to take the position that "the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The question of infallibility has been much before my mind since my condemnation. I have not as yet reached final conclusions, but I have some tentative suggestions for the consideration of scholars.

Man, as an intelligent being, ever seeks knowledge. He cannot be satisfied with uncertainty. He must have the truth and

[1] *The Authority of Holy Scripture.*

be assured of it. In the last analysis, truth in religion rests upon authority and certainty upon infallibility. There are three great fountains of divine authority, the Bible, the Church and the Reason. Each of these imparts certainty to mankind. It depends upon circumstances and training which one of these men may chiefly use, whether they rely upon one of them almost exclusively, or use two or three of them in varied relations. There are few who are willing to take an agnostic position; and even these are not content with it. Their aggressive agnosticism makes it evident that they are only nominally agnostic.

The history of religion shows that an infallible authority is necessary, because in religion everything depends upon God and what God would have men be and do. God has not left the world without a witness. In the Reason the voice of God speaks within a man. In the Bible God speaks in sacred records. In the Church God speaks in divine institutions. In fact, through all history men have been made certain of their possession of divine life and truth by divine voices speaking through these media. The reality of this experience cannot be questioned without an unwarranted scepticism, which, if used in other departments of human experience than religion, would undermine and destroy all institutions, all knowledge and all life. The scientific explanation of this experience in its varied forms is difficult, and men cannot be justly blamed for different theories about it. But facts and truth are not dependent upon theories about them.

Jesus Christ, when he had accomplished his redemptive work on earth, ascended to his heavenly throne to carry it on to completion. He did not leave his disciples on a troubled sea as "babes tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error." He gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers "for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up the body of Christ till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and

of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."[1]

The Christian Church in its great historic branches has always recognised the three great fountains of divine authority as sources of infallible guidance. The differences have only been in the relative importance given to them. Authority in Religion, and its corollary Infallibility, have been more discussed in the last century than ever before: the authority of the Reason chiefly by philosophers; the authority of the Church chiefly by Roman Catholics, and the authority of the Bible chiefly by Protestants. Criticism in its various forms has compelled these investigations. The same principles in great measure govern the three alike. The solution of the problem of any one of them is so involved in the problem of the others that the final solution will be the solution of them all.

I. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE REASON

The Reason is to be distinguished from the reasoning powers, as that more fundamental function of the soul upon which all reasoning depends, that function which determines the fundamental principles of thought, of morals and of religion, principles which do not depend upon experience, but which are prior to all experience—innate and inseparable from human nature as such. The metaphysical reason gives infallible decisions, which limit and define all intellectual activities. The moral reason, or the Conscience, gives an ultimate decision in matters of morals. The religious Reason, or religious Feeling, as it may be variously termed, is the vital cord which binds man to God and which is divine authority in all religious affairs. In this discussion I limit myself to the moral and religious Reason. We have to determine in what sense and to what extent it is infallible.

(1) It is evident from human experience that we cannot rely upon the Conscience to decide *abstract questions*, whether

[1] *Eph.* IV. 11–16.

they are right or wrong, well pleasing or displeasing to God. If we bring before the bar of the conscience anything of that kind, we wait in vain for a decision. We must distinguish the conscience from moral judgments based upon more or less consideration, or upon habits, or formulated principles of action.

(2) Even concrete questions which do not involve moral or religious action, have no decision from the Conscience.

(3) Practical questions that concern others than ourselves, the Conscience will not decide. The Conscience is the Conscience of the individual. It needs not the warning, "Judge not," that Jesus gave to his disciples. We may judge others by our opinions, feelings, and determinations of our will against them, but our Conscience will not sit in judgment upon them. The function of our Conscience is to judge ourselves, not others.

(4) The Conscience of the individual decides questions of morals and religion for the individual in the time of action, and decides them with final authority for the individual.

When a man acts in moral and religious matters, he must either ignore the Conscience altogether, or act in accord with its decisions, or act against it. In the latter case a man incurs the most serious guilt. The authority of the Conscience is infallible, notwithstanding apparent inconsistencies. The Conscience will decide for one course of action for one man and for another for another man. The Conscience will decide one way at one time and another way at another time, in the same man. The explanation for these differences is not in any defect in the Conscience. These inconsistencies do not involve any impeachment of its infallible authority. They are to be explained rather by the different circumstances that envelop the cases and make them really different. The Conscience decides like a court of justice upon the case in hand, and does not itself make any change in the case. If the case is not properly presented at the bar of the court, the decision will be correct so far as the case before the court is concerned, but may be altogether incorrect as to the real

merits of the case. A man usually does not honestly and sincerely present the case before the bar of Conscience. Commonly, the Conscience is neglected and men act in accordance with habit, or principles, or their own wilful judgment after more or less reflection. They do not submit their case to the Conscience. Or if in their perplexity they appeal to the Conscience, they present the case in such an insincere way that they become advocates for the wrong side, and so pervert the case that the judgment can only be the way they wish it. If we appeal to the Conscience, we must earnestly desire only the right decision and be willing to follow that decision at all costs. As Jesus said: "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God."[1] We may deceive ourselves and mislead our Conscience to our own destruction. We may grieve the divine Spirit within us, so that He may give us over to our own deceits and follies. But we should not impeach the infallible authority of the voice of God in the Conscience, which will always guide aright when there is an entire willingness to be guided.

The result to which we have come is this: The Conscience gives infallible guidance in any practical matter of our own religion and morals, but neither in abstract questions, nor in concrete questions apart from our own action or when involving the action of others. It gives no rules of conduct; but only a judicial decision of the particular action we are called upon to take, in the particular circumstances which surround it at the time, and in the light of the knowledge brought before it.

The Westminster Confession gives an instance of an infallible decision made by the Holy Spirit, through the religious feeling, in the assurance of Faith.

This certainty is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope; but an infallible assurance of faith founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidences of those graces unto which these promises are made, the testi-

[1] John vii. 17.

mony of the spirit of adoption, witnessing within our spirits that we are the children of God: which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. (Chap. xviii. 2.)

This illustrates quite well the divine guidance through the moral and religious Reason. It is a witness or testimony to a particular case or thing, a final infallible decision for the individual, but not an infallible *rule* for himself or for others.

If these definitions are correct, it is evident that we cannot build our religion upon the Christian consciousness as such, or Christian experience, or the conclusions of the intelligence by the use of the reasoning powers, or the decision of our ordinary moral judgments. All these give us only probability, not certainty. They cannot be regarded as authoritative or fundamental. They cannot be brought into the category of divine authority. They are altogether human. The only religious experience that is authoritative and infallible is that which the conscience and the religious feeling give us, in innate, *a priori*, immediate decisions, the voice of God Himself within us, where doubt and uncertainty are impossible.

II. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

The Infallibility of the Church is maintained by the Roman Catholic, Greek and Oriental Churches. All these recognise the infallibility of Œcumenical Councils. The Roman Catholics limit their infallibility to such of their decrees as are approved by the Pope. They also assert the infallibility of Papal decrees under certain defined circumstances even when apart from conciliar action. The Protestant bodies deny the infallibility of Councils as well as of Popes; and yet they implicitly claim divine authority for their own institutions and doctrines. In fact, the Protestant bodies have left this question, like many others, in which they differed from the pre-Reformation Church, in a very uncertain position. Thus the Westminster Confession asserts that "the presence of Christ and his Spirit makes effectual the

ministry, oracles and ordinances of God unto the Church."[1] But it does not define what is meant by "making these effectual." Is not the action of Christ and his Spirit divine, certain, infallible action? Can we say that it is fallible and uncertain? So in the definition of effectual calling

> God is pleased in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by His Word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone and giving unto them a heart of flesh, renewing their wills, and of His almighty power determining them to that which is good and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ. (Chap. x.)

The Confession takes the ground that all this is through the means of grace and ordinances of the Church, and not ordinarily, at least, apart from the Church, for it distinctly says: "out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."[2] Does not this effectual enlightenment imply infallibility, just as truly as does the effectual drawing imply almighty power, as is distinctly stated? Is it possible to think of such an effectual calling as uncertain and fallible? It is true that the Westminster Confession states that "all Synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the *rule* of faith and practice, but to be used as a help in both."[3] But that is not altogether consistent with the composition of the Westminster Confession itself and the requirements of subscription thereto. For that document certainly is set forth as binding upon all ministers of the Presbyterian Church. The American Presbyterian term of subscription represents that it is "the system of doctrine contained in Holy Scripture" and thereby gives a formal justification for its use. But this is no real justification, for, in fact, the Westminster Confession gives a final, authoritative interpretation of the Holy Scripture, and no one can appeal from the Confession to the Scriptures as a

[1] Chap. xxv. 3. [2] Chap. xxv. 2. [3] Chap. xxxi. 11.

higher authority against it. The Presbyterian Churches, in fact, just as truly as the Roman Catholic Church, require their ministers to accept the Holy Scripture "according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures"; and they allow liberty of interpretation only exactly where the Roman Catholic Church allows it, namely, as regards those things in Holy Scripture not already authoritatively interpreted by the Church. The Protestant Churches grant liberty of conscience, to deny the infallible authority of the Church, with one hand, and take it back with the other.

If the Church is a divine institution, and God speaks to mankind through the ministry of the Word, the authority of the keys, and the administration of the Sacraments, there must be in the Church, in some sense, not only authority but divine authority, and if divine, then certain and infallible. The problem is, wherein is this authority lodged, and how extensive is it in form and substance?

The Roman Catholic Church alone has attempted to limit and define the Infallibility of the Church. Therefore we must study its definitions as a help to the solution of our problem, whether we accept the infallibility of the Pope or not.

The doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church was in a very indefinite and uncertain condition until it was defined by the Vatican Council. Theologians were uncertain as to the extent of its subject-matter, and whether the infallibility was lodged in Œcumenical Council, or in the Pope, or in the consensus of the Church. The Vatican Council made a great and wholesome advance when it defined the Infallibility of the Church. The opposition to its decisions by many of the best Roman Catholic scholars was more academic than practical. The following is the definition of the dogma:

It is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman pontiff —— when discharging the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by reason of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals to be held by the whole Church, he by the divine assistance

promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Blessed Redeemer willeth that His Church should be endowed, in defining doctrines regarding Faith and Morals, and therefore such definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves inalterable and not from the consent of the Church.

According to the best authorities in the Roman Catholic Church, oral and written, this definition may be interpreted as follows:

(1) Infallibility is limited to "*a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals.*" Everything else is excluded from the area of infallibility, *i. e.*, the government, discipline, institutions and worship of the Church, and all doctrines that are not included in Faith and Morals. Everything not so defined is within the realm of things that may be changed in accordance with the progress of the Church in wisdom and efficiency.

(2) Infallibility of doctrines regarding Faith and Morals is limited to those "*to be held by the whole Church.*" Not all doctrines regarding Faith and Morals, held by teachers of the Church and promulgated by the authority of the Church, are infallible; but only those that are universal in their character. All others, which are not universal, are outside the limits of infallibility. It is evident that by far the greater part of the dogmas of Scholastic Theology are by this definition excluded from infallibility, and are made by this decision variable. Only a limited number of the dogmas of the theologians can be included under the category of universality; and still more limited are those which have not been already defined and are within the limits of a possible definition in the future.

(3) This clause: "To be held by the whole Church," implies by its historic usage, not merely that they are to be held by bishops, priests, and regulars, but also by the people. The people must accept them and hold them as dogmas upon which their salvation depends. They must, therefore be not theoretical dogmas, but *practical dogmas*, for guidance in faith and practice. This clause: "To be held by the whole Church," also implies that the definition is in re-

sponse to needs experienced by the whole Church. The Church throughout the world gives voice to the needs of the Catholic Church. It calls upon the Pope to give the official decision in the burning questions that excite and disturb the Christian world. The definition states that the decisions are of themselves inalterable and not from the consensus of the Church. This does not imply that the definitions are altogether independent of the consent of the Church, but that they do not wait for the consent of the Church in order thereby to become infallible. The consent of the Church has already been given when it appeals to the supreme authority in the Church for the definition of the question of faith or morals, which demands a solution that the Christian people, scattered throughout the world, cannot themselves give.

(4) Infallibility is limited to a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the whole Church, which *the Roman Pontiff defines.* The dogmas of Councils not defined by the Pope have no infallible authority. The dogmas of the theologians and of the fathers, however much they are to be reverenced, have no infallible authority. The area of infallible definitions of the Popes is quite limited, as much so as the doctrines of the Reformed, Lutheran and Anglican Articles or Confessions of Faith, which though not regarded as infallible, are yet so authoritative that dissent from them involves withdrawal or expulsion from these Protestant Churches.

(5) Infallibility is not in the definition of the Pope, as a person; but in the Pope as an official "*when discharging the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians.*" The Pope as an individual may be a heretic, as have been some of the popes. The Pope may write an official letter defining a doctrine, in an heretical way, as did Honorius. The Pope may define a doctrine, when it is submitted to him after careful consideration by one or more of the congregations in Rome, and may decide it wrong. In no one of these instances does the Pope define a dogma in the meaning of

the definition. It must not only be an official act, but it must be an official act of a supreme religious character, a transaction under the most solemn circumstances. The Pope acts in such a case "By reason of his supreme apostolic authority"—"by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter." He acts under the immediate guidance of the divine Spirit; the voice of God speaks in and through him, as it did in apostles and prophets, and therefore he gives infallible definitions which "are of themselves inalterable." Only one such definition has been made in modern times, that of the "Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin," by Pope Pius IX, and undoubtedly that expressed the wellnigh unanimous faith of the Roman Catholic world.

(6) The infallibility of the Church is still further limited to the definition of dogmas *divinely revealed in Holy Scripture and in apostolic tradition.* The Church has no authority to make new dogmas; but her authority is limited to the definition of dogmas divinely revealed at the original establishment of Christianity by Jesus Christ and his apostles. These definitions must be in accord with Holy Scripture and with apostolic Christianity. Inasmuch as the gift of infallibility is inherited from St. Peter through all the Popes in unbroken succession; all the definitions of the Popes since St. Peter, given in accordance with this definition, have been infallible; and, therefore, all popes from now on must define in accordance with the definitions of all the previous popes. There may be developments in the definition, but no new definition can be made that will in any way contravene the definitions of Holy Scripture, or apostolic tradition, or of the Church in its previous history.

(7) The infallible definition of a doctrine is limited to the *doctrine itself,* and is not extended to the *formula* in which the doctrine is expressed. All human language is fallible. At the best, language is an inadequate vehicle of thought. The doctrine is as infallible in one language as in another, in translations as in the original tongue in which it was de-

fined. Indeed, the same doctrine has been expressed by infallible authority in Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, by the Church in Greek and Latin, and then by different formulas in Greek and Latin. If any one formula were exclusively infallible, all the others would be fallible. The infallible authority of Popes is responsible for several variant forms, therefore the infallibility must be limited to the doctrine that underlies all official forms and to the same doctrine in all the varied forms.

It is evident, therefore, that the infallibility of the Church has been limited to comparatively few, simple and definite things. The Pope is infallible only when, *ex cathedra,* under the influence of the divine Spirit, he defines a dogma of faith and morals derived from Jesus Christ and his apostles and of universal importance for the faith and practice of all Christians. Apart from this he is not infallible. His decisions and definitions may be incorrect and erroneous, and may be reversed by himself and his successors.

In its definition of the Infallibility of the Pope and Councils, the Vatican Council made an important step in advance with reference to the question of infallibility, even for those who are not willing to lodge the infallibility of the Church in the Pope. Either there is Infallibility in the Church or there is not. If not, there can be no certainty in the ministerial functions of the Church, but at most probability. Protestantism in its great branches certainly stands for more than this. In its hostility to the older positions, it has neglected to define its own position. The Greeks hold to the infallibility of the Church, and lodge it in Œcumenical Councils, but are uncertain in their limitations of it. Only the Roman Church has worked out the problem, and we must follow her in the main in her limitations, even if we lodge infallibility elsewhere than in the Pope or in Œcumenical Councils.

It might be lodged, in accordance with the saying of Vincent of Lerins, "Semper, ubique et ab omnibus," in the

consensus of Christian antiquity, a position toward which Anglicans tend. It might be lodged theoretically in the consensus of Christian people throughout the world in accordance with the principle of Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum." It matters not where infallibility is lodged, it must be limited, very much as it is limited by the Vatican Council in connection with Papal Infallibility.

Papal Infallibility is an executive infallibility, it does not give a rule of Faith—that is found in Holy Scripture and in that alone. Papal Infallibility interprets, explains and applies this rule of Faith in executive decisions just as truly as do Protestant ecclesiastical bodies. The practical difference is that the Pope is frankly infallible whereas Protestant ecclesiastical bodies make themselves into little popes, theoretically fallible, but practically infallible, despotic and often less considerate of the rights of the individual than Papal courts.

The Roman Catholic Church claims sovereign and absolute authority for the Pope even in his fallible decisions. Beyond the range of his infallible decisions there is a vast and practically unlimited range of fallible decisions which demand the same measure of submission as do the infallible ones, so that practically the distinction is of little importance save that the infallible are irreformable, the fallible are reformable. The crying need of the Church, as is evident from the present extraordinary tyranny exercised against the Modernists, is to limit this fallible authority and to distinguish it practically as well as theoretically from the infallible authority. It is probable that when the Vatican Council reassembles, as it surely will ere long, it will take this question in hand and make some decision about it. It is just here that a Reform of the Roman Catholic Church is not only possible but probable. The Pope may be reduced from a theocratic despot to a limited monarch, or even a constitutional president and primate of the Church. The legislative and judicial functions now exercised by him

through cardinals, monsignori of his household, cabinet, or other inferior members of the Curia, may be given over to a General Assembly or Council, meeting periodically to represent the whole Church. The judicial functions may be given over to a bench of judges. Liberty of conscience and opinion may be recognised, defined and limited within just bounds, and its relation to the *magisterium* of the Church satisfactorily explained. The drift at present is certainly not in that direction; but some such reform must eventually be made if ever there is to be reconciliation, peace and unity in the Church.

How, then, may we reconcile the existing discord as to the Infallibility of the Church? We may do so by rising to a more comprehensive position that shall do justice to all of the conceptions, and harmonise them in a higher unity. The great difficulty with all the decisions of the Church, whether by Pope or Council, is that in most cases they are premature. The Council of Nice decided the Arian controversy theoretically but not practically; for several generations of warfare ensued before the Church as a whole adopted its conclusions, and then only after some modifications of the Creed. The decisions of the Council of Trent were premature. They did not settle the controversies of the Reformation; they emphasised them and embittered them, and made them permanent in the divisions of the Western Church. The Vatican Council forced the issue and drove many of the best Catholic scholars out of the Church, because they were not convinced of the infallibility of the Pope, and therefore could not in good conscience accept that dogma.

Our Lord promised the divine Spirit to guide into all the Truth, and the Church should always have waited patiently for this infallible guide to do His work. His decision is given in accordance with the principle of Vincent, when the Church everywhere, at all times and in all its representatives, has been guided by the divine Spirit to a consensus. That

decision becomes the decision of the whole Church when the whole Christian world gives its judgment with calm confidence.

The infallibility of the Church is in its possession of the infallible guidance of the divine Spirit. The divine Spirit gradually guides the universal Church to infallible results. The infallibility of the Church is in this consensus. This will eventually find expression in the government and discipline of the Church, in its legislative, judicial and executive forms; that is, through Councils and Popes. When Councils and Popes sum up this consensus they may be regarded as infallible, not in themselves, not even in the consensus, but because they are the official organs of the consensus which is the result of the infallible guidance of the divine Spirit. Usually Councils and Popes decide prematurely, and therefore are not altogether free from error. But, in the main, Councils and Popes are eventually justified by the consensus of Christianity, which revises their premature definitions and makes them for the first time practically infallible.

It may be said that this contravenes the statement of the Vatican Council, when it says: "Such definitions of the said Roman pontiff are of themselves inalterable and not from the consent of the Church." And indeed it does, unless that statement may in some way be qualified. As I have already shown, it is assumed in the definition that the condition of the whole Church is such that a decision of the question at issue is needed, and the decision is a dogma that the whole Church is required to hold. Theoretically, the consensus should have been reached before the decision was made, as in the case of the decree of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. If the decision be premature, as it has been in most cases, it may yet be infallible because of the "divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter." The fault of the Church in all such cases is, that it does not rely upon the divine Spirit, and the intrinsic power of the Truth, to bring the dissenters to a consent to the definition of the Church. The Church usually attempts to compel

their consent by external authority, and the use of material forces of constraint, in a tyrannical abuse of men's consciences and intellects.

If the divine Spirit has in reality guided the Pope or the Council to an infallible decision so that the Truth of God has in fact been proclaimed, then it is evident that if men of good will do not consent to it, it is because they have not been convinced; and if they have not been convinced, it is for the reason that the truth has not been stated with sufficient clearness, with sufficient evidence, and with sufficient qualifications to remove candid objections and serious doubts. The fault is then more with those who define the truth than with those who cannot accept it. Instead of trying to compel the mind and the conscience of the doubters by external authority with penalties for disobedience, the Church authorities should patiently strive to remove doubts and scruples, and to convince the doubter by explanations, qualifications and arguments. The Churches have sinned over and over against the Truth by insisting upon the dogmatic form of the statement rather than upon the Truth itself; and so they have sacrificed the infallible Truth to the human forms in which they have presented it.

The infallibility is in the divine Truth and Fact, not in any particular mode of stating them, and these become infallible to the Church when the divine Spirit gives the whole Church possession of them in a real Consensus. The official organs of infallibility are infallible in so far as they express that consensus, whether they be premature in their decisions, or make them when the Church is ripe for them.

III. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE BIBLE

The Infallibility of the Bible is maintained by the consensus of Greeks, Orientals, Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. But the nature and extent of the Infallibility have never been defined. It still remains in an indefinite and uncertain state. Extreme men have urged that the

Infallibility of the Bible should extend to the whole Bible, and everything in the Bible; but the Christian Church has not in any of its great decisions officially adopted such a position. The pre-Reformation Church and the Reformers took a healthy though indefinite position in the matter; but later Protestant scholastics went so far as to insist upon the infallibility of Hebrew vowel points. Modern Biblical Criticism has so shattered the doctrine of the total infallibility of the Bible that it has become necessary to distinguish in the Bible between what is infallible and what is not infallible. The tendency to make this discrimination is so decided and irresistible that it is usually made capriciously and arbitrarily and without sufficient reasons. The only way to overcome this peril is to determine the principles by which the discrimination should be made.

The limitations that have been made in the study of the infallibility of the Reason and of the Church help to make discriminations here also.

(1) The infallibility of the Bible should be limited to *doctrines regarding Faith and Morals.* All other matters contained in the Bible should be excluded from infallibility. Matters of Science are not infallible in the Bible any more than in any other writing. Matters of Geography, Chronology and ordinary History are not infallible. The only things in History that can be regarded as infallible are dogmatic facts, that is, realities of fact, event and experience which involve doctrines of Faith and Morals, and these only so far as they involve such doctrine. The exegetical principle of Augustine that "whatever cannot be referred to good conduct or truth of faith must be regarded as figurative,"[1] really amounts to this; for it rules out everything else except so far as its figurative sense yields doctrine or morals. This principle dominated the Church for more than a thousand years. However inadequate it may be as a principle of exegesis, it yet practically limits the infallibility of the Bible just where it ought to be limited.

[1] Briggs, *Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 450–1.

(2) The Infallibility of the Bible should be limited to those doctrines that have *universal significance.* Many matters of doctrine, even of faith and morals, are only temporary in their character, such as the Levitical laws of purification, and the ceremonial institutions of the priestly Law, from which Christians were exempted by the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem. Many instructions also have only local application, as some of the advice given by St. Paul to the Church at Corinth. It is necessary to rule out all this material from the category of infallibility, even if it had a temporary and local divine sanction. Not everything that has been approved by God, or even commanded by God through his inspired prophets, can be regarded as infallible.

(3) The Infallibility of the Bible should be limited to matters that concern *human salvation.* As the Articles of Religion of the Church of England say: (Article VI.)

> Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. (Article II.)

This is the chief purpose of Holy Scripture, to make known to men the way of salvation. Anything apart from that purpose is merely incidental and circumstantial. Only doctrines, and doctrinal facts and events that concern human salvation, should be regarded as infallible.

(4) The Infallibility of the Bible should be limited to *practical matters.* Merely theoretical questions, even when they are theories of prophets and apostles, may not concern the Christian life. The American Presbyterian term of ministerial subscription is instructive here. The minister subscribes to the statement that the Bible is the only infallible *rule of Faith and Practice.* If the Infallibility of the Bible had been limited to doctrines of Faith and Practice, the history of the Presbyterian Church would have been more fruitful, and they would be better prepared for the future development of Theology than they are at the present time. The

infallibility of the Bible should be confined to the Gospel in the Bible, the so-called little Bibles, those passages which contain saving doctrine and vital transforming power upon human life and conduct.

(5) The Infallibility of the Bible should be limited to the *substance of doctrine*, and not be extended to the form of words or the structural facts and events in which it is encased. Verbal inspiration is an impossibility in view of the results of modern Criticism. It is also impossible in view of the variations in language and formula in which these doctrines are expressed.

(6) The Infallibility of the Bible is not in the Bible as a written and printed library of books, but in the *divine Spirit* speaking through these books to the Christian individual and the Christian Church. The early Protestants took this position when they regarded, as the only divine evidence which gave assurance and certainty that the Bible was divine, the voice of the divine Spirit speaking in and through the Scriptures to the Christian. But later Protestants fell back from this position, which regarded the Bible as a means of grace, to a scholastic and pedantic position that the authority of Scripture was in the written records. It is often objected to this position of the early Protestants that it gives to every individual the right to make his own Bible. In fact, every pious man does have his own Bible, in the use of those passages which are his favourites because the divine Spirit has spoken through them to him. But, on the other hand, such individuals are not reluctant to accept the Bible of the Church as containing multitudes of passages which have influenced others, as much as his own choice passages have influenced him.

Indeed, this objection is more theoretical than practical. The individual Christian must follow the voice of the divine Spirit when it speaks to him in his Conscience, so also, just as truly, when the Spirit speaks to him in Scripture. He may be deceived in the one case as in the other. The deception is not in the divine Spirit, whether speaking in

Conscience or in Scripture, but in his own failure to distinguish between these and his own desires, opinions and self-will. He should recognise that there are other consciences besides his own, and that the divine Spirit speaks in Scripture to others as well as to himself, and that in this consensus of Christians he has a valid means whereby to verify his own private experience. The voice of the Church is the sum of the experience of a multitude as truly guided as he has been. If there remain discord and uncertainty after such a serious attempt at verification or correction, his only help is to again raise the question before the Conscience and the Bible, and to follow the voice of the divine Spirit to him at all costs.

In fact, the Council at Jerusalem, according to Acts XV, took just the position we have been trying to define with reference to the Old Testament Scriptures. St. Peter said: "Why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" If St. Peter were here to-day, might he not say the same with reference to the New Testament that he did then with reference to the Old Testament? The Council decided: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." Thus, under the guidance of the divine Spirit, they threw aside forever all the rest of the civil and ceremonial laws of the Old Testament. And even some of these things reserved in their apostolic decision were subsequently thrown aside by the Church. If so much of the Old Testament could be thrown aside by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit as no longer applicable, as not having regard to Christian salvation and the practice of the Christian life; it may be the case that the same kind of discrimination should be made in the New Testament also; for there are a multitude of things in the New Testament that are local and temporal in their character, that are theoretical and occasional

in their nature, and which have nothing to do with human salvation and a practical religious life. Some day a new Council of Jerusalem under a successor of St. Peter may distinguish between the infallible and fallible in the New Testament likewise.

The Church has, in fact, through all her history pursued this course of interpreting and defining doctrines regarding Faith and Morals contained in Holy Scripture under the guidance of the divine Spirit. The Church has always recognised the three great fountains of divine authority as the media by which the divine grace of enlightenment and spiritual invigoration comes forth upon mankind. There can be no real conflict between the three sources. Any apparent conflict is due to the erroneous use of them by fallible men and the false interpretation, or exaggeration, of their decisions.

IV. APOSTOLIC TRADITION

The Roman Catholic Church gives Apostolic Tradition a place alongside of Holy Scripture as having divine authority. This tradition must be (1) *apostolic.* It must go back to the apostles or to Jesus Christ himself: "The unwritten traditions, which, received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand." [1]

(2) It must have the *unanimous consent of the Fathers.* There can be little doubt that the Roman Catholics have exaggerated this tradition and that Protestants have no less certainly depreciated it. Cassander recognised and stated the inconsistency of Protestants in this regard. He called attention to the fact that the first article of the Augsburg Confession is based on ancient tradition, the Creed of the Nicene Council and the witness of the Fathers of the Church. The Protestants did not make the Scripture the

[1] Council of Trent, Sess. IV.

only rule of Faith; but in doctrine and institution alike, they gave great weight of evidence to the Fathers and primitive tradition. They distinguished in the tradition that which they accepted and that which they did not accept as valid.

Biblical and Historical Criticism have shown that you cannot build Historical Christianity upon the Bible alone. Tradition must be regarded as also at the foundation and pervading the entire history of the Church. Other Churches than the Roman use tradition, but in varying degrees of recognition, in the order: Roman, Greek, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, Puritan. The Puritan position is no longer tenable. If a tradition is apostolic in origin, why should it not have equal authority to a written tradition? Did the committing it to writing give it for the first time divine authority and make it infallible? If there be a unanimous consent of the Fathers to a Tradition, is that not of equal authority to a creed? Does the committing of a tradition to writing make it authoritative? The weakness of the Roman position is in the separation of this Tradition and Consensus from the authority of the Church, and its classification with that of the Bible. It has some features of the one and some features of the other. At any rate, the same qualifications and limitations should be made here as elsewhere.

It seems to me that it would be wiser to class apostolic tradition with the authority of the Church, rather than with the authority of the Bible. It is quite true that the entire Scripture of the New Testament was apostolic tradition before it was committed to writing, and that the chief difference between apostolic tradition and apostolic writings is that the one is unwritten, the other written, and that both differ from other authority in that they are alike apostolic. But, on the other hand, the apostolic writings are writings, and therefore give us a definite rule of Faith and Morals; whereas the apostolic tradition, unwritten and unformulated, cannot be regarded as a rule, but only as a help and guide. That tradition can only be determined by the consent of the Fathers. That consent is not a consent of the apostles,

but a consent of the primitive Church with reference to a tradition of the apostles. This consent is not merely an interpretation of tradition; it is a restatement of it, a formulation of it, and a recording of that tradition in which the authority of the Church is necessarily much more prominent than it is in the interpretation of Holy Scripture.

The very fact, that a consensus of the Fathers is necessary to verify apostolic tradition, shows that the very same principle is involved as in the determination of the authority of the Church, namely, the Consensus of the Christian Church.

V. THE THREEFOLD INFALLIBILITY

The Protestant Churches should limit the infallibility of Scripture in a similar way to that by which the Roman Catholic Church has limited the infallibility of the Church, and philosophers have limited the infallibility of the Reason. Protestants have committed a serious fault here, which they should hasten to overcome. Then the reluctance to accept the infallibility of the Bible by modern scholars and a dissatisfied people will gradually disappear.

The modern mind cannot accept any such absolute infallibility, either in the Bible, the Church or the Reason, as the older authorities maintained. The limitations that we have found in the infallibility of the Reason, the Church and the Bible, whether they are altogether correct or not, make it evident that we can have only a relative infallibility, an infallibility so far as the subject-matter, the circumstances and the persons make possible; but no more than this. As I have said:

> We cannot assume that when God speaks to men He must always speak an inerrant word. God is true. He is the truth. There is no error or falsehood in Him. He cannot lie. He cannot mislead or deceive His creatures. We may be certain of the inerrancy of the Speaker; but how can it be shown that the means of communication are inerrant, or that man is capable of receiving an inerrant word? It is necessary to consider that in all His relations to man and nature God conde-

scends. The finite can only comprehend a part of the infinite. God limits Himself when He imparts anything of Himself to His creatures. . . . Just as the light is seen, not in its pure, unclouded rays, but in the beautiful colours of the spectrum as its beams are broken up by the angles and discolourations which obstruct its course, so it is with the truth of God. Its revelations and communications meet with such obstacles in human nature and in this world of ours that men are capable of receiving it only in divers portions and divers manners. The only thing we can say is that God's word to man will be as inerrant as possible, considering the human and defective media through which it is communicated. (*General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 637 *f.*)

That which was then said of the Bible is just as true of the Church and the Reason. They give us not an absolute infallibility, but a relative infallibility, altogether reliable and certain so far as it goes, but needing to be enlarged, verified and enhanced by other and later, no less infallible, words of God to man.

The three fountains of divine authority are not and cannot be contradictory, because they are three different media for the same divine Being to make His authority known to mankind. We may compare them with the three great functions of government; the legislative, the executive and the judicial, which in the best modern governments conspire to express the authority of the nation. The Bible is the legislative principle of divine authority, for it is the only infallible *rule* of faith and practice. The Church is the executive principle of divine authority. It makes no rules save those which are executive interpretations and applications of the rules contained in apostolic teaching. The Reason is the judicial principle of divine authority to the individual man. The Reason, when it judges, must be followed at all costs. There is liability to mistake, in individuals and in ecclesiastical bodies, in interpreting the decisions that come through these three media. Two may usually be used for verification of any one of them.

If only this method of determining differences were pursued, the greater part of the practical difficulties of Christian-

ity would disappear. The consent of the three authorities would be overpowering and irresistible in its influence. Christianity, limiting itself to those things thus confirmed as infallible, would be invincible. All mankind would yield unquestioning obedience to it, as to the voice of God Himself.

IX

THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM

THE Christian Church has a Sacramental System, instituted by Jesus Christ and his apostles. And yet it is just this Sacramental System about which the Church is so greatly divided. The consensus of Christianity as to the Sacraments is set forth in the Chicago-Lambeth quadrilateral for the reunion of Christendom: the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, ministered with an unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him. The Christian Church throughout the world in all its divisions, at present and in the past, agrees to these two Sacraments, and the two things essential to these Sacraments: the words of institution and the elements of water, bread and wine. All agree also that the Sacraments are visible forms of an invisible grace.

The Churches of Christ differ: (1) Whether there are more sacraments than the two; (2) as to the relation of the sacramental grace to the persons of the Holy Trinity; (3) as to the relation of the grace conferred to the elements through which it is conferred; and (4) as to the effects of the grace upon its recipients.

I. THE NUMBER OF THE SACRAMENTS

There is a consensus in the Church as regards the two great sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist; there is dissensus as to any others. The Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church agree in recognising seven sacra-

ments or mysteries: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Unction, Order and Matrimony; and the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema upon any one who says that these "were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord." At the same time the Council declares that Baptism and the Eucharist are pre-eminent above the others and that the sacraments are not all of equal worth.

Again, the Council asserts that, although all the sacraments are not, indeed, necessary for every individual, yet none are "superfluous," and all are means of grace and salvation. Thus, Marriage is not necessary to all men and is forbidden to those in orders; and Order is reserved for the ministers of the Church.

When it is said that all these sacraments were instituted by Christ, it is not claimed that they were all instituted by words of Christ contained in the Gospels. Christ's commands are inferred from apostolic institutions. Thus, Confirmation is based on the authority of St. Peter and St. John,[1] and Unction upon St. James' Epistle,[2] but Baptism and the Eucharist, Penance, and Order are based upon the institution of Jesus Christ himself, as recorded in the Gospels, and Matrimony upon the recognition by Christ of this primitive institution.

The Lutheran Churches regard Confirmation, Penance, Order, and Matrimony as sacred institutions of the Christian Church, but refuse to class them with the Sacraments. The same is true of the Church of England, which revised the ancient Catholic forms and composed its own services for Confirmation, Penance, Order, and Matrimony. The Reformed Churches also recognised Confirmation, Penance, Order, and Matrimony as sacred institutions for which special services were composed. None of the Churches of the Reformation, however, used Unction.

The state of the controversy has so changed, in modern conditions and circumstances, that we may raise the question whether the dissensus as to the number of the Sacraments

[1] Acts viii. [2] V. 14–15.

is any longer of much importance. As Dr. Paget, Bishop of Oxford, said some years ago:

> The dispute as to the number of the sacraments is indeed "a question of a name" (Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 170); and it ought to have been acknowledged all along that the name was being used with different and shifting meanings. That men knew that it did not designate an essentially distinct class of exactly equivalent units is shown on all sides: St. Thomas Aquinas seems to doubt, at least, whether there are not more than seven Sacraments, divides the seven into groups with very important notes of difference, and decides that the Eucharist is *Sacramentorum omnium potissimum* (III, Qu. LXV. Art. 1, 4, 3); Calvin was not unwilling that the laying on of hands should be called a sacrament, though he would not reckon it "*inter ordinaria Sacramenta*" (Inst. IV., XIV. 20); the Council of Trent has an anathema for any one who says that the seven Sacraments are so equal that none is more worthy than another (Sess. VII. Can. III); Richard Baxter distinguishes between "three sorts of Sacraments"; in the second sense of the name, in which it is taken to mean "any solemn investiture of a person by ministerial delivery, in a state of Church privileges, or some special Gospel mercy"; he grants "that there are five Sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution, the Lord's Supper and Ordination"; and elsewhere he declares that "they that peremptorily say without distinguishing that there are but two Sacraments in all, do but harden them (the Papists) by the unwarrantable narrowing of the word" (*Confirmation*, pp. 88, 89; *Ecclesiastical Cases of Conscience*, Qu. 99). (*Lux Mundi*, pp. 42–45.)

The term Sacrament is not a Biblical term. It was not much used in the primitive Church, and not at all in the Greek and Oriental Churches, for the seven Sacraments of the Western Church. The term Sacrament is a Western term. In the scholastic terminology it became stereotyped with the distinction of the two parts, form and matter. It was only gradually, and not till late in the Middle Ages, that the number of the Sacraments became fixed as seven. The Greek Church went through the same development in its use of the older term, Mystery, which eventually embraced the same seven sacred institutions as those of the Roman Church.

The Reformers rejected five of these from the class of Sacraments, because of the exaggeration of them in ceremonies, and the many abuses and superstitions connected

with them. The most of these were, however, done away with by the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation of the Roman Catholic Church. What the Reformation really stands for, is not the denial that Confirmation, Penance, Unction, Order, and Matrimony are sacred apostolic institutions; but that they are not to be exalted into the same class as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But, really, the Council of Trent maintained the same thing. When the fathers of Trent assert that there are seven Sacraments, they, at the same time, pronounce an anathema upon the one who says that any one is not more worthy than another; so that really they class the two Sacraments by themselves as distinguished from the other five, though both groups are in the same general class; just as St. Paul is classed with the Twelve and others as apostles, while it is recognised that the Twelve really constituted a body by themselves; and that St. Peter was the primate of the apostles in jurisdiction as well as in honour.

Inasmuch as Greeks and Romans agree in the seven Sacraments, the Protestant Churches should abandon their opposition; only insisting that the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, stand by themselves as Sacraments of Sacraments, and that the other five are named Sacraments in a secondary sense, as sacred institutions of the Christian Church established by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

The Roman Catholic Church finds in all these seven Sacraments visible forms of invisible grace, and also makes in them all the Scholastic distinction between form and matter. The question as to form and matter has some importance in Dogmatic Theology, but is of no great importance for the question in hand. As to most of these sacred institutions, there is general agreement as to form and matter; but there is no consensus as to all of them in this regard, so that we may regard this question as still a debatable one, not finally decided by the Church. We may, therefore, give our attention to the essential question, whether these five sacred institutions are visible forms of invisible grace.

The Five Minor Sacraments

The Churches of the Reformation practically recognised all of the five minor sacraments as means of grace, except Unction. This, therefore, we shall consider first.

(1) There can be no doubt that *Unction* was a visible form of invisible grace to the sick, when the elders followed the advice of the Epistle of James in apostolic times. There should be no doubt that the Christian Church has in all ages used Unction as a means of grace. It was discredited at the Reformation and since then in Protestant Churches. It is one of the revenges of History, that it is now being forced back into the Protestant Churches by the number of sects which practise Faith Cure, Christian Science and the other like methods of religious cure. It would be well, therefore, if the Churches should at once restore the sacred and apostolic institution of Unction, and train their ministry in Pastoral medicine as Roman Catholics do. The Roman Catholics employ Unction chiefly in the form of "Extreme Unction" in the dying hour; but the Greeks adhere to the more ancient mode of using it for the healing of the sick. The Council of Trent is more correct in this regard than Roman Catholic practice. The Churches of the Reformation should not object to this admirable statement of the Council of Trent:

> Moreover, the thing signified, and the effect of this Sacrament, are explained in these words: *And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* For the thing here signified is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose anointing cleanses away sins, if there be any still to be expiated, as also the remains of sins; *and raises up,* and strengthens the soul of the sick person by exciting in him a great confidence in the divine mercy; whereby the sick being supported, bears more easily the inconveniences and pains of his sickness, and the more readily resists the temptations of the devil *who lies in wait for his heel* (Gen. iii. 15); and at times obtains bodily health, when expedient for the welfare of the soul. (Sess. xiv. 2.)

(2) The Sacrament of *Penance* was greatly abused in the Mediæval Church, and especially in the century preceding the great Reformation. This abuse was, indeed, the great exciting occasion of the Reformation. But abuse does not justify disuse, although it often has this result. The three parts of Penance, which constitute its matter, are contrition, confession and satisfaction. Absolution is its form. The Protestant Churches use the term Repentance instead of Penance. We should not, however, waste our strength in quarrelling about terms, especially when they are different translations of the same Biblical original and are explained in essentially the same way by both parties. The questions in controversy are: (*a*) whether the penance shall be public or private; (*b*) whether it shall be general or particular; (*c*) whether satisfaction shall be given to the one personally wronged, or whether the Church claims should also be satisfied; (*d*) whether the absolution shall be public or private.

(*a*) All agree that *Contrition* is essential to penance. Indeed, the Protestants make more of this than the Roman Catholics, many of whom weaken contrition into what is known as *attrition*, which is, as the Council of Trent says, an "imperfect contrition," that thinks of the punishment of sin rather than the guilt of it.

(*b*) The Roman Catholic Church makes private auricular *confession* of mortal sins necessary to salvation as "a laborious kind of baptism." The Protestant Churches permit, and in some cases advise, private confession; but for the most part require public confession as an essential part of public worship, and usually its initial part either before or immediately after the invocation of the divine presence. Protestants thus make much more of public confession before the whole Church; Roman Catholics of private confession before the priest, the representative of the Church. It should be said, however, that while the Roman Catholic Church recommends frequent auricular confession of all sin, it requires only the confession of mortal sins, and of these but once a year. Protestant Churches, however, require the

confession of mortal sins publicly before the whole congregation, according to the most ancient usage, that is, when these sins have become public and scandalous. The Roman Catholic Church requires the confession of all mortal sins, whether public or private, whether scandalous or not.

It is a common fault of the Churches that they multiply offences and aggravate mortal sins, far beyond any warrant in Holy Scripture or Christian experience. This overdoing destroys the sense of proportion in sin, and results inevitably in hardening the greater sinners and making the lesser ones morbid and self-torturing. There is room here for a better understanding of Christian morals, and a better adjustment of pastoral medicine, and a far better theory and practice of confession of sin, which should lead to a Christian consensus that would be of enormous benefit to all Churches.

The Roman Catholic priests urge the people to confession, far beyond any warrant in the principles of the Church; and Protestant ministers often press upon the people their own personal theories as to sins, which have no justification in the teachings of Holy Scripture or in the ethical doctrines of Protestantism. The inevitable consequence is great confusion in the minds of the people as to what is sin and what is not sin; and minor offences, and sometimes no real sins at all, loom up before them as great transgressions, while at the same time real and serious sins are overlooked.

(*c*) As regards *satisfaction*, the Roman Catholic Church is correct in principle; although in practice, its taxing of sins and its indulgences are productive, now even in their reformed uses, of great and inevitable evils. It is certainly true that the sinner commits an offence against the Church for which some satisfaction should be rendered. The Civil Law does not exempt a criminal from punishment when he satisfies his adversary by some form of compensation. The Civil Law forbids the injured party to compound a felony. By so doing he is acting against the interests of the community and obstructing the course of justice. So the Church as a government, with laws and jurisdiction, has the right

and, it may be said, the duty of exacting a penalty from those who sin against its laws. The Church of Rome carefully distinguishes between the temporal and eternal penalty; between that which the Church inflicts and that which God Himself threatens against the sinner.

The satisfaction made by Jesus Christ atones for all sin against God, and the penalty for that sin is remitted with forgiveness. Baptism and Penance are visible forms of this invisible grace. The Church is an institution of grace, and the forgiveness of sins is its great watchword. But the Church has the duty of impressing upon the sinner the penalty due the Church for the violation of his duties to the Church, even if it may remit them in whole or in part in its wise discretion.

In fact, all Protestant Churches recognise this principle, when they try before the church courts such members as are guilty of scandalous offences, heresies and schisms; and they do not hesitate to inflict penalties of reproof, suspension and excommunication upon such offenders. And they reserve the right of remitting the penalty when it seems best to them. Indeed, the Protestant Churches are more inclined to inflict severe penalties and less inclined to remission of penalties than the Roman Catholic.

Thus the Articles of the Church of England say:

> That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto. (Article XXXIII.)

It is just because there is no recognition of the rights of the Church to satisfaction in lesser offences, that the Protestant Churches have not learned to exercise the function of their remission; and dealing only with grosser offences they impose severer penalties from which they hesitate to retire.

(*d*) *Absolution* is given in the Lutheran and Anglican Churches by the priest in public after confession; in the

Roman Catholic Church, in private by the priest. In the Reformed Churches, the minister voices the repentance of the people, and absolution is *precatory*, and usually not merely a supplication for pardon, but also thanksgiving for the pardon received and enjoyed. It should be said that the public penance of the Protestant Churches, especially when attached to both morning and evening prayers, affords the people more frequent opportunities for ridding themselves of sin than the Roman Catholic method. It might be said that the Protestant method makes it too easy.

It should be recognised that absolution, as well as confession and all parts of penance, may take place in private as well as in public; and it should be left to the good judgment of the priest, and usually to the voluntary preference of the penitent, which method should be followed. I see no sufficient reason why a consensus should not be attained by men of goodwill, at least as to the essentials of the Sacrament of Penance, and then the details might be left to the different usages of the different Churches.

(3) *Confirmation* is not reckoned as a Sacrament by the Churches of the Reformation, but it is practised as an apostolic institution by the most of them. The Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, and the Non-conformists of England, Ireland and Wales, abolished confirmation because of the superstitions and formalities, which, they claimed, were connected with it; but they all of them adopted in its place methods of admission to the Holy Communion, sometimes public, sometimes private. But the private methods have for the most part disappeared, at least in America, and public ceremonies of various kinds have been reintroduced. Confirmation was originally closely connected with Baptism. The laying on of hands is not essential to its validity. In the Roman Catholic Church it is by anointing with the sacred chrism. The Greeks still closely connect Confirmation with Baptism, and also use the sacred oil. The Presbyterians and Non-conformists receive candidates, whether in public or private, with appropriate prayers, and usually the minister

gives them the right hand of fellowship, and sometimes other church officers do this also.

Whatever the ceremony may be, all recognise that it is a means of grace. It puts the seal upon Baptism, which it ratifies and confirms, and brings to its completion, in admitting the baptised for the first time to the Lord's Table. Why should we not agree upon the ceremony? Why should we not follow the usage of the Greek and Roman Churches, supported by centuries of Christian tradition, rather than modern ceremonies, or even the revival of the most primitive usage of the laying on of hands? Confirmation, whatever the ceremony, is a visible sign, and it does in all the ceremonies bestow invisible grace.

(4) The Roman Catholic and Greek Churches hold that *Order* is a Sacrament, that ordination to the ministry is a visible sign of an invisible grace. Does any Church deny that? Do not all the Protestant Churches claim that their ministry is based on our Lord's commission to the apostles perpetuated through all the ages by the ceremony of ordination? They differ as to the form of government in the Church, as to the Pope, as to Patriarchs, as to Bishops, as to the functions of Presbyters and Deacons; but all agree as to the reality of the grace of ordination. Why, then, should not this sacred institution be regarded by all as a Sacrament, not of the same worth as Baptism and the Eucharist, but nevertheless a sacred institution, a real mystery of grace? If the Eucharist is a sacrifice in any sense, the ministry which celebrates the Eucharist must be a priesthood in that same sense; and the ordination of such a ministry is sacramental in character, whatever may be said of other orders of the ministry than priesthood.

(5) *Marriage* was the last of the Sacraments to gain recognition; and rightly so, for, though a divine institution, it is more closely connected with civil government than with religion. Nevertheless, the Christian Church has always recognised the religious element in marriage, and it has always appealed to the teachings of Jesus Christ himself as

the supreme authority in marriage. The Churches of the Reformation, no less than the Roman and Greek Churches, celebrate marriages for their adherents, and are not content with marriages constituted by civil authorities. Marriage is not only a divine institution, but also an institution which Jesus Christ himself made additionally sacred. The question that concerns us here, is whether marriage is a visible sign of invisible grace.

There are many difficult subsidiary questions with which the chief question seems to be inextricably involved. It is evident that the value of marriage does not depend upon the use of any particular ceremony. Any ceremony, whether simple or complex, appointed by authority of Church or State, constitutes a valid marriage. A purely civil marriage must be recognised as a valid marriage, however defective it may be on its religious side. Cohabitation is, however, necessary to make it really effective, and that is usually regarded as the matter of marriage. Any form of words that makes the marriage valid by law may be regarded as the form of marriage, for these words are the effective words. The words of institution may be pronounced by a civil or ecclesiastical authority, or by the parties to the marriage themselves. This is a sacred institution which does not depend for its validity upon any particular words uttered by Christ or his apostles, but upon a contract between the parties, ratified by Church or State.

It is an unfortunate situation in the United States, that the Christian minister acts in the marriage ceremony in a double capacity, both as an officer of the civil government and as a minister of the Church, responsible to two independent and in some respects conflicting jurisdictions, so that sometimes he is troubled in conscience as to his duty under the circumstances. It would be a happy solution of many difficulties, if the State always made the civil marriage by civil officials, as in Switzerland. Then Christians might have the marriage ratified by the Church in a religious ceremony. The situation would then be similar to that of clinical baptism;

valid indeed, but irregular, and only to be justified by necessity and needing supplementary religious ratification by the ministry of the Church. So, lay marriage is a valid marriage but irregular, and needing the religious ceremony to give it full sacramental value as a real means of grace and salvation. It is of immense consequence to Christianity that the Christian Churches should come to an agreement on this important subject, and then establish an understanding with the civil governments as to the laws respecting marriage. This may be accomplished by insisting only upon essentials, and reserving theories and subordinate matters for determination by particular jurisdictions.

I have gone over the five Sacraments which the Greek and Roman Churches add to the two recognised by the Protestant Churches. I have shown that they all have the essential features of Sacraments, visible signs of invisible grace. They all have the scholastic parts of form and matter; although the five are not of the same high value as Baptism and the Eucharist, as Greeks and Romans agree.

The Mediæval Church recognised, beyond the range of the seven Sacraments, other sacred things, such as the crowning of a king or the consecration of church buildings, as *Sacramentalia*, also having form and matter. Some Protestants have thought that we might classify the five lesser Sacraments with these *Sacramentalia* rather than with the two great Sacraments; but reflection shows that this would be a mistake; because the five lesser Sacraments are in their nature more in accord with the two greater ones than they are with these *Sacramentalia*. The consecration of a church building is the consecration of a material thing and not of a person. How can it be a means of grace to persons as are the five lesser Sacraments? The consecration of a king is to officiate in civil not in religious functions. We can hardly think of the impartation of saving grace in this instance. The Sacraments are not for the impartation of the divine favour and blessing; they are means of grace and salvation.

The Protestant Churches should abandon their opposition to the recognition of the five lesser Sacraments as Sacraments, and limit themselves to the insistence that all superstitions, extravagances and abuses should be removed from them in the Reform of the Roman Catholic Church; and that the five lesser Sacraments should be carefully discriminated from the two greater ones, Baptism and the Eucharist.

II. THE RELATION OF THE DIVINE GRACE IN THE SACRAMENTS TO THE PERSONS OF THE HOLY TRINITY

The divine grace conferred in the sacramental system comes from God Himself. What, then, is the relation which God maintains to that grace?

1. *Sacramental Grace*

God the Father is the fountain of all grace, of all love and of all salvation. The grace is His grace and the salvation is His salvation. Therefore, that grace bears within itself divine characteristics. These may be summed up in these three adjectives: *sufficient, efficient* and *irresistible.* (*a*) The divine grace in the Sacraments is *sufficient.* It is amply sufficient to accomplish its purpose of salvation. The grace is really there in the Sacrament—it is there abundantly—it is there preveniently—not waiting for human action, but preceding, anticipating all human wants, and superabundant above all human needs. To this all Churches agree.

(*b*) The divine grace in the Sacrament is *efficient;* it really accomplishes the divine purpose of grace. Those who use the Sacraments should have no doubt or fear lest the Sacraments fail in their effects; but should have faith, confidence, assurance and certainty that what God has promised He will most surely perform, and that the right use of the Sacraments will always be effectual to themselves and to others. There will be degrees of efficiency, depending upon circumstances and environment; but these degrees do not

depend upon the divine provision, which is superabundant; or upon the priestly administrator, who merely fulfils the functions and carries out the intention of the Church, whose servant he is; but solely and alone upon the capacity of the believer to receive the grace provided. The divine grace will fill his little vessel full to overflowing all the time, good measure, pressed down and running over its utmost capacity. All the Christian Churches agree in this doctrine, however little it may be realised in practice.

(*c*) The divine grace is *irresistible.* At this point the differences in Christianity appear. It is not meant in Church doctrine that it is so irresistible as to take away the freedom of the human will, on the part of those who use the Sacrament. The divine grace is irresistible when bestowed, not when withheld; when the divine energy is put forth, not when it is restrained. It is fully recognised that there are invincible obstacles in some human natures, which God might overcome by His omnipotent power, if He would; but which He will not overpower at the cost of human impotence, and which it is doubtful if He could overcome without the destruction of moral natures. In all the operations of the divine grace, there are preparatory grace and consequent grace, all of which is resistible. The irresistibility of the divine grace is at the supreme moment when man no longer resists but is passive to the putting forth of the divine power, and simply receives what God bestows. The divine power of grace is moral and not physical, except so far as the physical may be an instrument of moral influence, and not as in itself producing moral results.

This doctrine of *irresistible* divine grace in the Sacraments originated the subsidiary theory of the *opus operatum;* that is, that the Sacraments are *irresistible* in their very use. This is thus stated by the Council of Trent:

> If any one saith that by the said Sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed (*ex opere operato*), but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace, let him be anathema. (Can. ix.)

This was designed as a condemnation of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession, which says:

> Therefore they condemn those that teach that the Sacraments do justify by the work done (*ex opere operato*), and do not teach that faith, which believes the remission of sins, is requisite in the use of Sacraments. (Art. iii.)

There seems to be an irreconcilable contradiction between these two formulas, and yet it is not altogether so; for the Council of Trent does not teach that faith is not requisite in the use of Sacraments; and the Augsburg Confession does not state that faith in the divine promises alone suffices for the obtaining of grace. Both parties misunderstand and mistake the position of the other; misled, doubtless, by extravagant statements made by controversialists on both sides. The Council of Trent rather says that

> Faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and the root of all Justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and to come into the fellowship of His Son. (Can. viii.) . . . The Sacrament of Baptism, which is the Sacrament of faith (without which faith no man was ever justified). (Can. vii.)

And the Council recognises that there may be invincible obstacles to the reception of the divine grace on the part of those who use the Sacraments.

On the other side the Augsburg Confession asserts that "Baptism is necessary to salvation, and that by Baptism the grace of God is offered" (Art. ix); and that in the Supper of the Lord "the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper" (Art. x); and that we must use the Sacrament so as to join faith with them, that believes the promises that are offered and declared unto us by the Sacraments (Art. xiii). The real difference here is one of emphasis and of different definitions of faith and justification.

The difference comes to a head in the term *ex opere operato*, but even here the difference is misstated. The Augsburg Confession does not say that the divine grace is not conferred

ex opere operato, but it denies that the Sacraments do *justify ex opere operato.* The Council of Trent does not assert that the Sacraments *justify ex opere operato,* but that they *confer grace, ex opere operato.* The Council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession agree that there can be no justification without faith; they agree that the Sacraments contain grace and confer grace where faith exists, and where there is not the invincible obstacle of unbelief. The Roman Churches are concerned as to the preveniency and actual working of the divine grace; the Protestants, as to the necessity of a living and appropriating faith. I see no sufficient reason why concord might not be reached by better definitions.

2. *The Sacramental Work of the Holy Spirit*

God the Holy Spirit is the most direct agent in the administration of the grace of God in the Sacraments, as in the other means of grace. He is the surrogate of the Father and also of the Son. His temporal mission is by His presence in the Church and agency in all her institutions. He makes the divine grace effectual unto salvation. His agency in all the Sacraments is universally recognised, only not by all to the same extent, and not by any to the extent that it should be. It is the merit of the Greek Church, that it retains in the Canon of the Mass the invocation of the Holy Spirit, immediately after the recitation of the words of institution, and before the fraction. The Roman Mass has, instead of the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the prayer that God may

> Command these elements to be brought up by the hands of Thy Holy Angel to Thy Altar on High, before the sight of Thy divine Majesty, that as many of us as by partaking of the altar shall have received the most sacred body and blood of Thy Son may be fulfilled with all heavenly benediction and grace.

The English Mass of 1549 retained the ministry of the Holy Angel, but substituted for the *elements* which he was to take up to the divine altar the prayers and supplications of the people. It also inserted the invocation of God to bless

and sanctify the elements "with the Holy Spirit and word." Both of these invocations were removed from the later English Order for the Holy Communion, and so connection was lost with both the Greek and Roman Canons. The American Prayer Book followed the Scottish Prayer Book and the Mass of 1549, by the reinsertion of the invocation of the word and Spirit, but changed the order of these two so as to subordinate the work of the Divine Spirit to the word of institution.

The work of the Divine Spirit in the Sacraments should be emphasised, and that is the path to Christian concord. It is just here that the Reformed Churches have great merit; for they insist that the efficacy of the means of grace is due to the working of the Divine Spirit rather than to anything intrinsic in the means themselves. It is here that they object to the Roman Catholic doctrine of *ex opere operato* as too mechanical and magical, and urge that it is the personal presence and direct agency of the divine Spirit that energises and vitalises these means of grace, and gives them a personal efficacy to human persons. It cannot be said that Roman Catholics or Greeks deny this. But it must be said that the Reformed Churches deserve the credit of exalting the work of the divine Spirit, by insisting upon his liberty of action; even though they may have gone too far in claiming for the divine Spirit so great a degree of independence of the means of grace as that these may be faithfully used without being effectual; because the Holy Spirit may have been absent from them, when they have been received by persons who are not numbered among the elect of God. When a Reformed divine writes of the "Baptismal regeneration of *elect* infants," he denies regeneration to non-elect infants even if they have been rightfully baptised. In his zeal for the doctrine of election, and the divine sovereignty, and the freedom of action of the divine Spirit, he makes the right use of baptism altogether uncertain in its bestowal of grace.

The later separation of regeneration from baptism, by the Methodists and Evangelicals, in the interest of the personal experience of regeneration, made baptismal regenera-

tion still more uncertain to a large number of Anglo-Saxon Christians. In their zeal for the religious experience of regeneration they failed to distinguish that from the regenerative work of baptism, which may or may not be connected with that experience. Baptismal regeneration is one thing, spiritual regeneration is another thing; they may coincide, they may not.

The Calvinistic insistence, that the regenerative work of the divine Spirit is not tied necessarily to the sacramental elements of baptism, is undoubtedly important, in so far as that the divine Spirit may regenerate those who, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine, have the baptism of desire, but who for various reasons cannot receive the Sacrament of Baptism; but when, on the other hand, it is claimed that the divine Spirit may not be operative when the Sacrament is validly performed, it is an entirely different matter.

If there is no Sacramental grace in Baptism, made effectual by the divine Spirit, but all that it stands for may be received by the inward work of the divine Spirit upon the soul in conversion, then the Quakers and Salvationists are correct in their refusal to use Baptism. The only justification for its use, is that it bears with it a sufficient and effectual sacramental grace, and that thereby through the personal action of the divine Spirit a personal union is effected of the baptised with Christ and his Church. All Christian Churches, however faulty they may be in theory, in fact regard Baptism as the door of entrance into the Christian Church. The pathway to concord here is in a fuller recognition of the work of the divine Spirit in the Sacraments, without in any way depreciating the grace which is offered and conveyed by them in their proper use.

3. *Sacramental Presence of Christ*

The Sacraments gain their chief significance in that they are institutions of Jesus Christ himself, which also bear with them to us the real presence of Christ himself, the Son of God, the Son of the Father, the Redeemer of mankind.

The chief question here is as to the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist; but that is not the only question, for the presence of our Lord in Baptism is also an important question, though often disregarded. Indeed, the water of baptism stands for the cleansing and vitalising blood of Christ, just as truly as does the wine in the Holy Communion. But the question of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is so profound a question, and one upon which so much depends, that we must spend our strength upon that, especially as the solution of that question will carry with it the solution of all the others. The Council of Trent

> teaches, and openly and simply professes, that in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, God and man, is *truly, really* and *substantially* contained under the species of those sensible things. (Sess. xiii, chap. i.)

The adjectives *truly, really* and *substantially* express the antithesis to three several theories of the presence which are hereby rejected. Our Lord is *truly* present under the species of bread and wine, and not merely *figuratively* or symbolically present. He is *really* present and not merely *virtually*, through the virtue or benefits that the Sacrament bestows from him. He is *substantially* present as body and blood, and not merely present by his spirit apart from his body. Two Canons make this still more distinct.

> If any one denieth that in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained *truly, really* and *substantially* the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure or virtue, let him be an anathema. (Can. i.) . . . If any one saith that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema. (Can. viii.)

The first Canon was designed to rule out the Zwinglian opinion, the second, the Calvinistic; but it does not state the Calvinistic theory correctly, and only rules out what

Calvin himself would repudiate. Reserving for the present the relation between the elements and the presence of Christ, and limiting ourselves to the reality of the presence of Christ, we may state that Calvinists also maintain the true, real and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. When the Calvinist feeds on Christ in his heart by faith with thanksgiving, he not only partakes of him spiritually, but also sacramentally and really, as we pray:

> Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful hodies may be made clean hy his hody and our souls washed through his most precious hlood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.

Calvin says:

> For there are some who define, in a word, that to eat the flesh of Christ, and to drink his blood, is no other than to helieve in Christ himself. But I conceive that in that remarkahle discourse in which Christ recommends us to feed upon his hody, he intended to teach us something more striking and suhlime; namely, that we are quickened hy a real participation of him, which he designated by the terms *eating* and *drinking*, that no person might suppose the life which we receive from him to consist in simple knowledge. For it is not *seeing* hut *eating* hread that administers nourishment to the hody; so, it is necessary for the soul to have a true and complete participation of Christ, that hy his power it may he quickened to spiritual life. At the same time, we confess that there is no other eating than by faith, as it is impossihle to imagine any other; hut the difference hetween me and the persons whose sentiments I am opposing is this: they consider eating to he the very same as helieving; I say, that in believing we eat the flesh of Christ, hecause he is actually made ours by faith, and this eating is the fruit and effect of faith; or, to express it more plainly, they consider the eating to he faith itself; hut I apprehend it to he rather a consequence of faith. The difference is small in words, hut in the thing itself it is considerahle. (*Inst.*, Bk. iv, chap. 17, (5).)

Though the eating and drinking are by faith, and in so far a spiritual appropriation, yet there is a spiritual appropriation of the body and blood of Christ which are, by means of faith, sacramentally and really eaten. So far as the true, real and substantial presence of the body and blood of

Christ in the Eucharist is concerned, Roman Catholic, Greek, Oriental and Calvinist agree. There are only differences of statement as to the mode of the sacramental presence and the sacramental eating and drinking. Those who disagree from the consensus which we have found, are ministers and people who are not in full accord with the teaching and practice of the Churches to which they belong. Irenic divines should emphasise and state more fully and comprehensively the consensus, and recognise that the dissensus is really of small importance.

III. THE RELATION OF THE GRACE CONFERRED TO THE ELEMENTS, THROUGH WHICH IT IS CONFERRED

We have seen that the divine grace conferred by the Sacraments is a sufficient, effectual and irresistible grace, and that it bears in it the divine presence as well as the divine power, and that the divine presence is especially the presence of Jesus Christ himself. The difficult question now emerges, how is that presence connected with the elements themselves? This is the question upon which Christendom is so greatly divided. The question chiefly concerns the Eucharist, and in connection with the Eucharist it must be decided.

1. *Conversion*

The ancient term for the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was *Conversion*. This is the term still used in the Greek Church. It is also the official term of the Roman Catholic Church, for the Council of Trent says

> that by the consecration of the bread, and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called transubstantiation. (Cap. iv.)

It is evident, therefore, that Conversion is the official term, and that Transubstantiation must be interpreted in the sense

of Conversion, of which Transubstantiation is a suitable and proper equivalent. The term Conversion is older than the Scholastic Theology, and more wide-spread in the Church than the Mediæval Scholasticism. It is the true Catholic term, of which Transubstantiation is said to be the Scholastic equivalent. And so it was the proposal of the great irenic Roman Catholic divine, Spinola, Bishop of Neustadt, Vienna, that conversion should be the term upon the basis of which the reunion of Christendom should be sought. This proposal was approved by the Pope, and the cardinals, and the general of the Jesuits in 1688, and agreed to by Leibnitz, the greatest Protestant scholar of his age, and it should be always regarded as the basis for concord by irenic divines. Indeed, Transubstantiation did not become an official term in the Catholic Church until the fourth council of the Lateran in 1215, and it cannot be understood apart from the Scholastic terminology of substance and accidents. It stands and falls with this philosophical distinction, whereas Conversion is older than the Scholastic Philosophy, and is entirely independent of its technical terminology.

The ancient Catholic doctrine was, that the consecration of the elements by the use of the words of institution, and the divine agency connected therewith, converts the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord, so that our Lord's body and blood are really present, under outward forms of bread and wine, and not merely symbolically or figuratively present. The doctrine of Transubstantiation goes further and defines that conversion as a transubstantiation of the whole substance of the bread and the wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. The accidents of bread and wine remain after consecration as before consecration. All that the senses can discern are still bread and wine, but the substance of bread and wine, in which these accidents inhere, is no longer there. The whole of that has disappeared and the accidents remain without any substance whatever to sustain them. The whole of that has been changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, which can

only be discerned by faith and not by the human senses. This is in general the doctrine of the Council of Trent. But the Liturgy of the Mass is much older, and it abides by the ancient Catholic doctrine of conversion.

The Churches of the Reformation all rejected the dogma of Transubstantiation with the Scholastic distinction of substance and accidents therein involved; but they could not agree upon any dogma to put in its place. Luther's theory is usually called *Consubstantiation,* although it is generally agreed by Lutherans that this term is not altogether appropriate. At the same time the Lutheran dogma is sufficiently distinct as stated in *The Formula of Concord:*

> We believe, teach and confess, that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and they are truly distributed, and *taken together with the bread and wine.* . . . We believe, teach and confess that the body and blood of Christ are taken with the bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth, nevertheless not Capernaitically, but after a spiritual and heavenly manner, by reason of the sacramental union. (Art. vii, Affirm. 1, 6.)

This conception of a sacramental union of the substance of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine was Luther's way of conserving the strict interpretation of the words of institution, and at the same time avoiding the Scholastic dogma of Transubstantiation and the abuses of many kinds that had been attached to it in the age of the Reformation.

The Swiss reformers could no more accept Luther's dogma than they could that of the Scholastic Theology. Zwingli reverted to the figurative or symbolic interpretation of the words of institution, and insisted that Christ's body and blood were locally at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, and that they could not be in any other place, and certainly not in many places. Zwingli reduced the presence of Christ to a spiritual presence, the presence of the person of Christ to the person of the believer by means of faith. According to this doctrine, there was no real presence at all of

the body and blood of our Lord; and so the Eucharist became essentially a memorial Supper, little more than an ancient Love Feast, celebrated in obedience to the Lord's command; and the sacramental communion was little more than spiritual communion without the Sacrament. The Swiss reformers were not content with Zwingli's view, and so, gradually after his death, the Reformed Churches adopted Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist.

Calvin asserted the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Eucharist to the believer, discerned by faith; but he did not attach that presence so closely to the elements as Luther did; and so the elements were taken into the mouth, but not the body or blood of our Lord, which could only be discerned and used by faith. Calvin's doctrine, or rather Bucer's, which was essentially the same, was adopted by the Church of England in the Articles of Religion, and also in the Book of Common Prayer, especially in the words:

> Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

Melanchthon also adopted Calvin's view, which had all along been essentially his own, as well as Bucer's; and it finally prevailed in the Evangelical Churches of Germany. The official doctrine of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches is Calvinistic, and so also of most other Protestant denominations. But it is probable that most American Protestants have departed from the official doctrine of their Churches and are rather Zwinglians than Calvinists. Charles Hodge exerted a sad influence in this direction.[1] The Calvinistic theory, while it avoids most of the difficulties felt by scholars with regard to Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, still has difficulties of its own which have made it unacceptable to many modern British and American Protestants. As Van Dyke says:

> There is in our day a wide-spread defection from the doctrine of the Sacraments as taught in all the Creeds of the Reformation. This de-

[1] System. Theol. III, pp. 646-50.

parture is not only nor chiefly towards Rome. The drift is much stronger in the direction of a vague formalism, which makes the holy ordinances instituted by Christ mere outward signs having no divinely appointed connection with an inward and spiritual grace. "Low Churchmen" in all denominations vie with each other in making the Sacraments simply memorials of Christ and badges of a Christian profession. (*The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments*, p. 162.)

It is difficult to understand how it is possible for the body and blood of Christ to be eaten and drunk by faith. It is easy enough to understand how faith with the aid of the memory and the imagination can recall to mind and vividly realise the presence of the Christ of the cross, and of the Lord's Supper, or even imagine the Lord as priest and victim at the right hand of the Father; but that is the going forth of faith to the absent Christ, not the coming of the body and blood of Christ to us in the Eucharist. If this were all there is in the Lord's Supper, the Friends and Salvationists would be correct when they say, "We can remember our Lord and realise his presence much better apart by ourselves in prayer and religious meditation than we can in the public ceremonies of the Eucharist."

The official doctrine of the Reformed Churches is altogether different from this. As the Gallican Confession says:

> Although he be in heaven until he come to judge all the earth, still we believe that by the secret and incomprehensible power of his Spirit, He feeds and strengthens us with the substance of his body and blood. We hold that this is done spiritually, not because we put imagination and fancy in the place of fact and truth, but because the greatness of this mystery exceeds the measure of our senses, and the laws of nature. In short, because it is heavenly, it can only be apprehended by faith. (xxxvi.)

Thus the Reformed Churches recognise the real presence of the body and blood of Christ our Lord in the Eucharist, and that his body and blood are discerned by faith and eaten and drunk by faith. Now it is easy to understand that they may be mentally discerned by faith in the use of the religious memory and imagination; but it is difficult to understand,

on any principle of Philosophy, how faith can feed upon the body of our Lord. In fact, there is no avoidance of the conclusion that faith can feed upon the body and blood of our Lord, after all, only in a figurative sense, and in no real sense. Calvin himself, and the Gallican Confession, and other Reformed theologians and Confessions, state distinctly enough that they mean, as has been shown, that there is a sacramental feeding which is distinct from faith, although mediated by faith. But without this qualification the ordinary Calvinistic statement, that we eat and drink of the body and blood of our Lord by faith, is exposed to the following criticism of the Formula of Concord:

> Under these high-sounding phrases, they hide and hold fast the same gross opinion (as the Zwinglians), to wit, that besides the bread and wine, there is nothing more present, or taken with the mouth, in the Lord's Supper. For the term "spiritually" signifies nothing more than the spirit of Christ, or the virtue of the absent body of Christ and his merit which is present. . . . But they think that the body of Christ itself is in no way present, but is contained above in the highest heaven, and they affirm that it behooves us by the meditation of faith to rise on high and ascend into heaven, and that this body and blood of Christ are to be sought there, and nowise in union with the bread and wine of the Holy Supper. (Art. vii.)

It is necessary for the Calvinists to go further and define what they mean by eating and drinking as distinguished from believing. The Calvinistic theory is too indefinite to be altogether satisfactory.

It should be admitted that the Lutheran and Calvinistic conceptions of the Eucharist have no philosophy whatever to sustain them. These theories were efforts to conserve the Biblical teaching without the complication and inconvenience of the Roman dogma. The Roman Catholic conception has at least the Scholastic Philosophy at its back. This is doubtless the reason why the Zwinglian conception has to so great an extent taken possession of the modern Protestant world, especially in Great Britain and America. It is intelligible, it is rational so far as communion with

Christ is concerned; but then, in fact, the Sacrament ceases to be a real Sacrament altogether, because such communion may be enjoyed much better apart from the Sacrament than by the use of it.

It ought to be evident that the Christian Church has not yet solved the problem of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, so far as his relation to the elements of bread and wine is concerned, and that it is better to adhere to the ancient Catholic term *Conversion* as a basis for further investigation, as Spinola and Leibnitz urged, rather than the Roman Catholic Transubstantiation, the Lutheran Consubstantiation or the Calvinistic feeding by faith.

2. *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*

We must now take up the question of Sacrifice in connection with the Eucharist; for the doctrine of the presence really depends upon that of Sacrifice. The theologians in the Middle Ages had lost in great measure the Biblical doctrine of sacrifice. The doctrine of a substitutionary atonement had led them to emphasise and exaggerate substitution in sacrifice, and to regard the death of the victim as the essential thing; just as in the doctrine of Christ, the Middle Ages thought more of the Cross than they did of the Incarnation or of the Resurrection. The Mass thus became to them essentially an expiatory sacrifice and the immolation of the victim the essential element. Such conceptions, prevalent in the pre-Reformation Church, were open to the objections made by Protestants on the basis of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and stated rather rudely in the Articles of Religion:

> The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone: Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits. (xxxi.)

The Protestant Churches, when they rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, owing to the common errors connected with it, did not substitute for it the Biblical doctrine of Sacrifice, or give their just value to the Biblical elements contained in the Catholic doctrine. According to the New Testament, Jesus Christ is at once the great High Priest after the Order of Melchizedek, and also the sacrificial victim, who sums up in himself the significance of the entire sacrificial system of the Old Testament.

Biblical Theology has entirely transformed the conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice in recent times. It was not the function of the priest to slaughter the victim, but to present the flesh and blood of the victim at the divine altars. The significance of the sacrifice did not consist so much in the immolation of the victim, as in the use that was made of the flesh and blood of the victim after it was slaughtered. This use of the flesh and blood gradually originated four kinds of sacrifice: the Peace offering, the Whole Burnt offering, the Sin offering and the Trespass offering. In addition to these there were the unbloody offerings of bread and wine which usually accompanied the bloody offerings, but which might be offered by themselves, under certain conditions and circumstances.

Now, in the New Testament, Jesus Christ is represented as summing up all the sacrifices in himself.[1] This is distinctly recognised by the Council of Trent, when it says:

> This, in fine, is that oblation which was prefigured by various types of sacrifices during the period of nature and of the Law; inasmuch as it comprises all the good things signified by those sacrifices, as being the consummation and perfection of them all. (Sess. xxii, cap. 1.)

At the same time the Council of Trent puts the emphasis upon the propitiatory sacrifice, and does not give the other sacrifices their proper value and importance.

(*a*) The most primitive and wide-spread of the ancient sacrifices was the so-called *Peace offering*, whose chief signifi-

[1] See Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 525 f.

cance was in the communion meal, in which God shared with the offerer and his friends. This kind of sacrifice branched out into several kinds: the Covenant sacrifice, in which, besides the eating of the flesh of the victim, the blood was scattered about upon the people to consecrate them to the Covenant of Horeb, once for all at the origin of the national religion; the Passover sacrifice, where the flesh and blood were used in a similar way at the annual commemoration of the Exodus from Egypt; and numerous thank-offerings, votive and festal offerings, in which the blood went to the divine altar, but the greater portion of the flesh of the victim was eaten at the communion meal. Now there can be no doubt that the Christian Eucharist was connected by our Lord according to the Gospels with the Covenant Sacrifice, and the Passover;[1] and by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians,[2] not only with these but also with the thank-offerings and festal offerings.

The two essential features of the Sacrifice are the offering of the flesh and blood to God by the priest, and the partaking of the flesh and blood by the people. Now it is evident that the Holy Eucharist has these two essential features.

But before considering these, it is important to consider the relation of the unbloody sacrifice of bread and wine to the bloody sacrifice of flesh and blood. The earliest Christian writers regarded the Eucharist as that unbloody sacrifice, the pure *Minchah* predicted in Messianic times by the prophet Malachi.[3] This opinion has always persisted in the Christian Church, and reappears in the Council of Trent, when it says:

> This is, indeed, that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice of those that offer, which the Lord foretold by Malachias was to be *offered in every place, clean to his name, which was to be great among the Gentiles.* (Sess. xxii, cap. 1.)

[1] Mk. xiv. 22–25; Mt. xxvi. 26–29; Lk. xxii. 15–20. See Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 120 *sq.*

[2] XI. 23–26; x. 16–21; v. 7. See *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 100 *sq.*

[3] I, 11. See p. 64.

The Council connected the unbloody sacrifice with the bloody in this way:

> The victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different. The fruits, indeed, of which oblation, of that bloody one, to wit, are received most plentifully through this unbloody one. (Sess. xxii, cap. 2.)

The Eucharist is a sacrifice, in that it has the two chief parts of the sacrifice of the Peace offering, the offering of the sacrifice to God, and the partaking of the sacrifice by the communicants.

The offering is an unbloody one of bread and wine at the earthly altar—it is a bloody one of flesh and blood at the heavenly altar, both offerings by the great High Priest himself, the earthly one through the mediation of his priests, the heavenly one directly by our Lord himself. The Greeks, Orientals and Roman Catholics offer the elements of bread and wine. When the Anglican Mass substituted for these elements, in the Canon of 1549, "our prayers and supplications," it is evident that they meant to exclude the *elements* from the sacrifice, and make it one merely of *prayer*. The Reformed Churches take the same position, although they avoid the term sacrifice, on account of the abuse of it by the Roman Catholics. These great Churches of the Reformation made a great mistake here. They retained the use of the bread and wine, and yet they interpreted the sacrifice in terms of prayer. This, however, only introduces another difficulty into a situation already in itself sufficiently difficult, for we had to make the connection between the elements of bread and wine, and the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ; and now we have to make the still further connection between the prayers of the people and them both. If the sacrifice offered is simply and alone prayers, in what respect does the offering of prayers at the Eucharist differ from the offering of prayers at Morning and Evening Prayer? The only difference is the subject-matter of the prayers, that they are eucha-

ristic prayers. What, then, is it but that the sacred elements may become a real eucharist by the union of the elements with the body and blood of Christ?

This union is effected, according to the Greek Canon, by the power of the Holy Spirit implicitly taking the elements to the heavenly altar and explicitly bringing them to the earthly altar as the body and blood of Christ. In the Roman Mass this is accomplished by the Holy Angel explicitly taking the elements to the Heavenly Altar and implicitly returning them to the earthly altar. In the Anglican Canon of 1549 both agents are mentioned together with the words of institution. In the Scottish and American Episcopal Canons, the words of Institution and the Holy Spirit are the agents of the change. In these several conceptions it is recognised that the elements of bread and wine are made to the communicant the real body and blood of Christ by the divine power.

The altar table of the Church is attached to the heavenly altar, the unbloody oblation is attached to the bloody oblation, in such a sacramental way that, to use the words of the Council of Trent, "the fruits, indeed, of which oblation, of that bloody one to wit, are received most plentifully through the unbloody one." The Church on earth, by its union with Christ through his high priestly office, offers Christ himself as a perfect sacrifice to God on the altar table of the Church in the form of bread and wine; on the heavenly altar in the form of flesh and blood of the victim of Calvary. We should recognise and assert that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, an offering of an oblation by the Church, and not shrink from sacrificial conceptions because of the misuse of them that is sometimes made.

The Eucharist is also a sacrifice in the second great essential feature, the participation in the communion festal meal. The Eucharist is in its very nature the Lord's Supper in which the communicants eat and drink consecrated bread and wine. The bread and the wine of the unbloody sacrifice confer all the benefits of the bloody sacrifice which is perpetual in the heavenly sanctuary. The communicants in

some sense eat the flesh and drink the blood of the victim of Calvary. Jesus Christ died on Calvary once for all; there can be no repetition of the killing of the victim. He offered himself once for all to the Father, as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. He was accepted as such a sacrifice when he rose from the dead and returned to the bosom of the Father. While in this sense the offering was made once for all, yet it was made not as a momentary act begun in that moment and ceasing in that moment; it was made to be and remain for all time a permanent sacrifice, always valid for all who will avail themselves of it. The only way in which men can avail themselves of it is by sharing in the offering and in the communion. As our Lord said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves."[1]

The essential significance of the sacrifice of the Eucharist is in the Peace offering in its various forms. But the Eucharist also sums up and comprehends the meaning of the entire sacrificial system of the Old Testament, which was gradually unfolded in history, we may say, to prepare for the sacrifice of Calvary, and to enable us to understand that sacrifice after it had been made. Thus Jesus Christ is the *Whole Burnt offering* in that "He gave himself up for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell,"[2] and from that point of view it is proper for the Anglican Canon to emphasise the sacrifice of prayer which the Whole Burnt offering characteristically represents and bears up in the flame unto God. It is also proper that the communicants should present their "bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God."[3] This kind of sacrifice should not be overlooked in the Holy Eucharist.

But Jesus is also the *Sin offering*, the great propitiatory sacrifice. As St. Paul tells us, we are

> justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation (or propitiatory), through faith, by his blood. (Rom. iii. 24, 25.)

[1] John vi. 53. [2] Eph. v. 2. [3] Rom. xii. 1.

Inasmuch as the fruits of the propitiatory sacrifice are received through the Eucharist, it is quite proper to say with the Council of Trent that the sacrifice of the Eucharist

> is truly propitiatory, and that by means thereof this is effected that we obtain mercy and find grace *in seasonable aid*, if we draw nigh unto God, contrite and penitent, with a sincere heart and upright faith, with fear and reverence. (Sess. xxii, cap. 2.)

There is no valid reason for objecting to this statement, for it is not open to the Protestant objection that it discredits the one sacrifice of Calvary.

The *Trespass* offering does not appear explicitly in the New Testament, but it does implicitly in the teaching of Jesus himself, when he represented in the synagogue of Nazareth that he was the martyr prophet of Isaiah liii, who is also there represented as a trespass offering. It is just this trespass offering which emphasises the idea of compensation for wrong-doing, and a substitutionary sacrifice. The Eucharist certainly ought to convey to our minds ever the thought that the sufferings of Christ were in our behalf, and in our stead, and that he is ever both as priest and victim, interposing for us at the right hand of the Father, advocating our cause and guaranteeing as our surrogate the ultimate fulfilment of the conditions of our acceptance with God.

3. *Dramatic Representation*

Having considered and defined the chief elements of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and shown its relation to the several kinds of sacrifice, we may now, without peril of misconception, consider the whole process of sacrifice according to the Biblical forms. These were (1) The selection of the victim; (2) the consecration of the victim; (3) the slaughter of the victim. All these acts were performed by the one who proposed to make the sacrifice. The priest fulfilled these functions only as a representative of the community, when the community as a body offered sacrifice. The proper work of the priest was (4) the presentation of the appropriate

parts of the victim at the divine altar; (5) finally, there was the use of the appropriate parts of the victim by the offerer. Although the chief significance of the offering was in the last two functions, yet the preceding functions also had their significance, and may therefore be regarded as having their appropriate significance in the Holy Eucharist. From this point of view we may see, (1) the selection and approval of the victim by the divine voice which said, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased";[1] (2) the consecration of the victim in the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism; recognised as such by John the Baptist, when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."[2] (3) The immolation of the victim was upon the cross of Calvary.

The Christian Church has ever seen in the Eucharist a dramatic representation of the entire process of sacrifice. Thus the Council of Trent says that Christ

> because that his priesthood was not to be extinguished by his death, in the Last Supper, on the night in which he was betrayed, that he might leave his own beloved Spouse—the Church—a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be accomplished on the cross might be represented, and the memory thereof remain even unto the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit, declaring himself constituted *a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek*, he offered up to God the Father his own body and blood under the species of bread and wine. (Sess. xxii, cap. 1.)

From this point of view, of the institution of the Holy Eucharist before the crucifixion; and of the priestly offering unto God, and the sacramental communion, before the resurrection and ascension, it is necessary to take a more comprehensive survey of the Eucharist and consider all the elements of sacrifice. The term which the Council of Trent uses for this purpose is that of *Representation*. This also, like Conversion, is an ancient term altogether independent of modern controversies. It was on that account urged by

[1] Mk. i. 11. [2] John i. 29.

the Roman Catholic Cassander as a basis of unity on this subject. In 1564,[1] he said that the Mass should be regarded by all as a *remembrance and representation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ continued in heaven.* This was adopted and proposed again by Bishop John Forbes,[2] in 1620; and finally by the great theologian and statesman of the Reformed Church of Holland, Hugo Grotius, in 1641.[3]

So, one of the chief Roman Catholic divines of the sixteenth century, Vasquez (+1604), states that the Mass is a *commemorative sacrifice;*[4] and he regards the consecration of the elements as the really essential thing in the sacrifice of the Mass. This, then, is another basis upon which irenic divines may stand for an ultimate reconciliation of the contending theories and the reunion of Christendom. The Eucharist in its whole extent is a *commemorative sacrifice, a remembrance and representation of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ in the entire process, on earth and in heaven.*

From the comprehensive position we have now gained, the differences between the Churches appear to be different degrees of emphasis of particular things, and the neglect of other no less important things connected with the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, rather than differences of real antagonism and of mutual exclusion. All Churches should rise above their narrow and particular views to broader and higher conceptions, and so, unity will be attained.

4. *The Body of Christ*

Having considered the Eucharist as a sacrifice, we are now better able to return to the question as to the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. We may say without doubt that our Lord is present both as priest and as sacrifice. As priest, he is ever present with the priesthood in all their ministrations in accordance with the apostolic commission,

[1] *Consultatio.*
[2] *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum.*
[3] When he republished Cassander's *Consultatio,* with annotations.
[4] *Disput.* 220, n. 26.

"Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."[1] When the ministering priest offers the elements of bread and wine, Christ himself offers them mediately through him, as he offers his body and blood at the heavenly altar. But it is especially as the sacrificial victim that Jesus Christ is present in the bloody sacrifice of his own flesh and blood, and in the unbloody sacrifice of the bread and wine.

We have seen that the two are united by divine action in which the three persons of the Holy Trinity conspire. Let us now consider if we can get any further light upon the nature of the sacramental union. The body of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, consecrated at his baptism, crucified on Calvary, rose from the grave, ascended into heaven, is enthroned at the right hand of God, and will return in glory to the earth at the second advent. This is the doctrine of the Universal Christian Church. But the Church has not made enough of the reigning Christ, and has been negligent in her study of the body of our great High Priest.

The body of Christ remained the same throughout all its earthly and heavenly experiences, but its properties and qualities were certainly changed at the Resurrection. The body of the risen and glorified Christ is a spiritual, heavenly, incorruptible, glorious body; the same in substance as the earthly body; but different in the elements of which it is composed and in their qualities. The earthly elements, that belong to this earth, disappeared, and only those elements which belong to a spiritual state of existence remained in the heavenly body. Accordingly, Christ's heavenly body is not subject to the laws which govern the material world, but only to those which control the spiritual universe.

We can know but little positively about a spiritual body, but we can know much negatively, what it is not. We may say at once that all the objections ordinarily urged against a sacramental union of the body of Christ with the elements of bread and wine are irrelevant; because they are all based on a misconception of the nature of Christ's body and blood

[1] Mt. xxviii. 20.

as material substance instead of spiritual substance. As the Council of Trent says:

For neither are these things mutually repugnant, that our Saviour himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, he be in many places, sacramentally present to us in his own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely explain it in words, yet can we by the understanding, illuminated by faith, conceive. (Sess. xiii, cap. 1.)

This, indeed, is in accord with St. Paul's words:

So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a sensuous body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a sensuous body, there is also a spiritual. So also it is written, "The first man, Adam, became a living soul." The last Adam is a life-giving spirit. However, that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is sensuous; then, that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy: the second man is of heaven. (I Cor. xv. 42–47.)

(*a*) The body of Christ is not present under the species of bread and wine in the manner of material substance, but of spiritual substance. As the Roman Catechism says:

We do not say that Christ our Lord is in the Sacrament inasmuch as he is great or small, terms which appertain to quantity; but inasmuch as he is substance. For the substance of bread is changed into the substance of Christ not into his magnitude or quantity. (II. iv. 42.)

It is not the earthly body of our Lord that is present; that was laid aside forever when he rose from the dead; but his heavenly body. It is, indeed, the substance of our Lord's body, but spiritual, not earthly substance. It is the spiritual flesh and blood which the glorified Christ ever presents to the Father in the heavenly sanctuary, not that earthy kind of flesh and blood with which he was clothed when he lived in Palestine. If the ghostly body of the risen Christ passed through closed doors without hindrance,[1] why should we say that his glorified body may not pass through the outward

[1] John xx. 26.

enclosures or accidents of bread and wine? Do these present to spiritual substance any greater obstruction than wood or stone? Matter is usually impenetrable; but there are light rays which penetrate and illumine material things. Why may not the glorified body of Jesus Christ do as much? In the Christophany of the Apocalypse, the Son of Man appears as pure, white, dazzling light, and yet with a human body blazing forth that light.[1] According to the narrative of the Gospels, the risen Lord appears and disappears at his pleasure; is known to his intimates, or disguised from them, at his will. Who can say that he may not disguise himself in the forms of bread and wine, and make himself known or not at his pleasure, in the breaking of bread?[2] Yahweh, in the Old Testament, who, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, is the Christ of the New Testament, appears in theophany in a great variety of forms: of man, of angel, of fire, of cloud, of light and of voice. May not the glorified Christ of the New Testament appear in the forms of bread and wine? A theophany is not a mere appearance, it is a real presence of God in sensible forms for the purpose of revelation. In the Apostolic History there were several Christophanies to St. Peter and St. Paul, and in all of these the glorified Christ was really present in his body. He was seen. He was heard. He was recognised by his apostles. The theophanic presence of the glorified Christ may help us to understand his sacramental presence. In both cases alike his body is not subject to the laws of the material world. His body is a spiritual body, whose powers we can know only from evidences derived not from ordinary human bodies, but from spiritual bodies.

The Roman Catholic Church, equally with the Lutheran, rejects the so-called Capernaitical, gross, sensuous or cannibalistic eating of the body of Christ. It is a sacramental feeding, not an eating with the teeth, a mastication in the mouth, a digestion in the stomach; even if it be thought with the Lutheran that the body and blood of Christ are

[1] Rev. i. 13–16. [2] Lk. xxiv. 13–35.

taken with the elements into the mouth, because of the sacramental union; or if with the Roman Catholic it is supposed that the body and blood of Christ remain under the species of bread and wine so long as any particle of the species of bread, or any drop of the species of the wine remain undissolved.

(*b*) The presence of Christ in the elements of the Holy Communion is not a local presence. The Catholic Church has always rejected the theory of *Impanation*, as if Christ himself became bread and wine, in a similar manner to his becoming flesh at the Incarnation. Christ is not shut up by the priest in the bread and the wine as a Jack in a box—the common, vulgar representation of polemic Protestants at the time of the Reformation. The presence of Christ is not an enclosed presence in any sense. As Cardinal Newman says:

> If place is excluded from the idea of the sacramental presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion. Our Lord, then, neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but he does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of spirit. (*Via Media*, II, p. 220, ed. 1877.)

When we speak of God, or of Christ, or of the Holy Spirit as coming or going, ascending or descending, we use anthropomorphic expressions, accommodating spiritual realities to the material world in which we live, in order that they may be more vividly realised in our human experience. Locality and space are metaphysical forms of material things. God cannot be localised. He is omnipresent. The Lutherans assert the ubiquity of Christ's body in the Eucharist, not in the sense of omnipresence, but in the sense of multipresence, wherever Christ wills to be present in his body. But the Roman Catholic Church rightly refuses this theory of ubiquity, and limits its affirmation to sacramental presence.

The problem of the presence of Christ is a deeper one than

is ordinarily supposed. What do we mean by the omnipresence of God the Father, and of the divine Spirit, and of the Logos, the Son of the Father, as the Mediator of the universe? When we think of the Son, coming forth from the bosom of the Father to become incarnate, is the bosom of the Father localised at some particular place in the universe? Wherever the Father is, there is the Son, and the divine Spirit. The bosom of the Father is an omnipresent bosom for the Son. When the Son became incarnate, he did not come from a place distant or near. He came forth from the Spirit world into the material world; from an illocal existence into a local existence. So when the Son returned to the bosom of the Father as the risen and glorified God Man, did he go to a particular locality of the universe? Is God's right hand limited to one spot in the heavens? Is not God's right hand everywhere, where God is? If this be so, the ascension was simply the departure of the glorified body of Christ out of the material world into the spiritual world, out from under the dominion of spacial relations into the freedom of spiritual and divine existence.

This is, indeed, attested by the abandonment of local ideas in the New Testament itself when allusion is made to sacred places. Christ himself is the altar, the temple, the most holy place, the propitiatory of the Christian dispensation, summing up in himself not only priesthood and sacrifice, but also altar and temple and all sacred places. The heavenly altar is Christ himself, and Christ is wherever God is.[1]

We have no means of knowing how spirit may be present in localities, when in itself it is free from special limitations; but we may know from the theophanies of Holy Scripture, and from the Incarnation of our Lord, that the divine may manifest itself in localities; and that is all that the sacramental union of the spiritual body of our Lord with the elements implies.

We do not define sacramental presence in the sense of omnipresence, any more than in the sense of multipresence;

[1] See Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 543.

but we do say that a divine presence may manifest itself in localities without thereby limiting itself to localities; it may manifest itself in sensuous form without thereby becoming sensuous itself. And, further, it may manifest itself in many places at the same time without thereby limiting itself to any one, or to all of those places. And when we say that Christ's glorified body may be present in the Eucharistic elements, we say that it may manifest itself in these sensible forms without thereby becoming itself sensible. This is what the distinction between substance and accidents was designed to set forth in the scholastic doctrine of the Eucharist. The accidents, the sensible forms, all that can be detected by the human senses, are the accidents of bread and wine. The substance in which these accidents inhere is no longer bread and wine, after the divine power is put forth in connection with the words of institution. These substances have disappeared, and the substance of the body and blood of Christ have taken their place, not thereby made sensuous to be discerned by the senses, but remaining spiritual substance to be discerned only by those who by regeneration have been made capable of spiritual discernment.

(*c*) The presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharistic elements is not a spacial presence of size or shape or any kind of extension. This is distinctly stated by the Council of Trent:

> Wherefore it is most true, that as much is contained under either species as under both; for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and under any part whatsoever of that species; likewise the whole is under the species of wine and under the parts thereof. (Sess. XIII, cap. 3.)

Every particle of bread conveys in it the whole Christ to the communicant; every drop of wine conveys the whole Christ to the one drinking it. And so it is impossible to think of any division of the substance of Christ's body and blood. The bread may be broken into any number of particles, but Christ's body is not broken. His body, whole and entire, is in every particle of that bread. The wine may be distributed

into an indefinite number of drops; but the whole Christ is in every drop. It matters not how great the loaf may be, or how small the particles may be, Christ, whole and entire, is in that loaf, great or small, or in that cup, if it be a drop of wine or an ocean of it. As St. Paul says:

> The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread. (I Cor. x. 16–17.)

There are those who say that these distinctions deprive the heavenly flesh and blood of Christ of their reality as flesh and blood. Flesh and blood thus explained are, after all, only symbols figurative of real flesh and blood. That is, however, incorrect, for there is something more in flesh and blood than material substance. There is the power of life which departs at death, and there is nourishment which is transformed into poisonous tendencies soon after death. Flesh is of value in sacrifice because of its nourishing quality. Bread has the same quality to a lesser degree. Blood is of value in sacrifice because the Scriptures regard it as the seat of life. It has quickening and invigorating power, and therefore is used not only in sacrifice, but also in ceremonies of purification as the greatest of all purifying agencies. No Church holds that the material substance of the flesh and blood of the Christ of the cross continued in his body which ascended from earth, reigns in heaven and is present in the Eucharist. But the Church in all ages has held that the substance of flesh and blood, in which the material properties or accidents inhere, persists in the spiritual body of Christ with properties suited to a heavenly state of existence. It is proper to name this spiritual substance flesh and blood, because it has the same relation to the spiritual body that flesh and blood have to the natural body; because there is unity and continuity between their two states of existence; and because they have the same effect upon the spiritual nature that flesh and blood have upon the material

nature—they impart life, reinvigoration, nourishment and growth to the children of God.

The presence of Christ in the elements is therefore a presence of spiritual substance, and not the presence of material substance; it is a presence entirely independent of the laws of matter. It is a Christophanic presence using sensible forms of matter merely for purposes of manifestation, and of mediating the transference of spiritual substance to human beings—spiritual natures, indeed, yet clothed with material substance and under the dominion of sensible forms, and subject to the laws of the material universe.

From this point of view we may see that the differences of opinion as to the relation of the elements of bread and wine to the body and blood of our Lord are not so great as they appear. The Roman Catholic says that the substance after the consecration of the elements is the substance of the body of Christ, the accidents are those of bread and wine. The substance of the body of Christ there present has none of the qualities of matter. All the qualities of matter, weight, impenetrability, size, shape, locality, magnitude; all the qualities of bread and wine discernible by the senses, of sight, touch, smell and taste, and "the quality natural to bread, of supporting and nourishing the body,"[1] remain in the accidents. And these "accidents cannot inhere in the body and blood of Christ," but "in a manner altogether superior to the order of nature, they subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject."

The Lutheran says that the body of Christ is in, with and under the forms of bread and wine. The Calvinist says that the body of Christ is sacramentally present with the elements of bread and wine. The chief differences are those of definition and disagreement as to the philosophical distinction of substance and accidents, rather than differences as to the realities. The Roman Catechism distinguishes the accidents of matter even more carefully from the body of Christ than does the Lutheran, although not so sharply as

[1] *Cat. Rom.* II, iv. 38.

the Calvinist. But all agree that the body of Christ is sacramentally present with the elements, and all agree that it can only be spiritually discerned. All agree that the only thing the senses can detect, the only properties of matter present, are those of bread and wine, and those properties nourish the natural man at the same time that the body of Christ feeds the regenerate man.

5. *Christophanic Presence*

We may understand still better the results we have thus far attained, if we compare the three chief examples of sacramental communion reported in Holy Scripture : the communion of the Church of Corinth; the communion of the Twelve at the institution of the Lord's Supper in the upper room of Jerusalem on the night of the betrayal, reported in the Gospels; and the communion of the Israelites in the wilderness; all alike reported by St. Paul in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. One of the most eminent Roman Catholic theologians in Rome agreed with me that we must find a doctrine of Eucharistic presence that would satisfy the conditions of these three historic communions.

The eucharistic communion of the Church of Corinth, like all other Eucharists subsequent to the resurrection of our Lord, is a feeding upon the risen and glorified body of Christ. His heavenly body, the very one enthroned at the right hand of the Father, is given by the great High Priest, Christ himself, to his people at his table. The eucharistic communion of the apostles at the institution of the Eucharist was somewhat different. They fed upon the body of Christ before it was crucified, and so, before it was raised from the dead and glorified.

Bishop Gore[1] takes the position that this institution of the Eucharist was an anticipation of glory, akin to the Transfiguration. This opinion is due to a too narrow view of the Eucharist, as only a communion in the spiritual body of the risen and glorified Christ. If the original communion

[1] *Body of Christ*, p. 312.

at the institution of the Lord's Supper was only an anticipatory one, it was not real but ideal. How, then, could it have been a real institution? How could it have been an eating of a real covenant sacrifice? Unless it was a real communion, the Eucharist was not instituted by our Lord himself on the night of his betrayal, but only represented and prefigured by him. This theory seems to destroy the Eucharist, in so far as it is the great initial sacrifice of the New Covenant.

On the night in which he was betrayed, our Lord, reclining at the head of the table, gives his body and blood to the apostles in connection with the elements of bread and wine. If this is true, then the high priesthood of Christ did not originate when he ascended into heaven to the heavenly altar, and he did not first become the victim when he suffered on the cross. John the Baptist, indeed, saw in Jesus at his baptism "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world";[1] and the Baptism itself was at the same time a recognition and a consecration of Jesus as the holy victim and the high priest, as well as prophet and king of the kingdom of God. Accordingly, Möhler, the great Roman Catholic controversialist, says that

His whole life on earth—his ministry and his sufferings, as well as his perpetual condescension to our infirmity in the Eucharist—constitute one great sacrificial act, one mighty action, undertaken out of love for us, and expiatory of our sins, consisting, indeed, of various individual parts, yet so that none of itself is, strictly speaking, the sacrifice. In each particular part the whole recurs, yet without these parts the whole cannot be conceived. (*Symbolik*, *S.* 308.)

F. C. Baur, his great antagonist, says:

There lies no ground for a difference between Protestants and Catholics, and it can only be regarded as a peculiarity of expression, if the Catholic prefers to name the presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper a sacramental sacrifice, in order to indicate thereby its connection with the great act of sacrifice in his incarnation and humiliation in the flesh. (*Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, *S.* 400.)

[1] John i. 29.

It is, indeed, necessary for Catholics and Protestants to take this more comprehensive position, in which they can agree, in order to understand the original institution of the Eucharist.

The Twelve ate the lamb about to be slain, as the post-resurrection disciples ate the lamb that had been slain. That which is common to both eatings is the essential body of Christ, and not anything that was special to either of his states of existence. The body of Christ which the apostles ate, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, was not that body which they saw reclining at the head of the table; it was a body which might in some way separate itself from that material body, and in their very presence, undiscerned by their senses, connect itself sacramentally with the bread and wine which the Lord distributed to them. If, now, the Lord could give his body to them to eat, without in any way changing his material body in their full vision, he certainly may give his body to his people after his resurrection, without in any way changing his glorified body at the right hand of the Father. He who was transfigured before his apostles on the mountain of Galilee, by some similar process converted the bread and the wine, which he distributed to them, into his own body and blood.

We have, however, a third, and in some respects a still more instructive, instance of sacramental communion. St. Paul tells the Corinthians:

> For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, how that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ. (I Cor. x. 1–4.)

Now it is evident that St. Paul here identifies the Pillar of cloud and fire, the continuous theophany of the Exodus, with the pre-existent Christ. He also represents that the manna, the bread from heaven, was not only material meat, but spiritual meat; and that the water from the rock was

not only material water, but spiritual drink; and that that spiritual meat and drink was Christ. In other words, the Israelites in the wilderness, by eating of the manna and drinking of the water from the rock, ate and drank the pre-existing theophanic Christ.[1] Here we have the theophanic Christ, appearing in the sky above them as cloud by day and fire by night, giving to the people on the earth his theophanic substance to eat and to drink.

The sacramental union of the elements of bread and wine or water with the theophanic substance of Christ is the common feature in these three instances: the theophanic substance of the pre-existent Christ before the Incarnation; the Christophanic substance of the glorified Christ after the Resurrection; the Christophanic substance of the incarnate Christ in his earthly state. It is evident, therefore, that it is the Christophanic substance which is the common feature and is the essential thing in the sacramental union; and it is just this thing that the history of Biblical Theophanies and Christophanies helps us to understand in connection with the elements; for in these varied Theophanies, which are all really Christophanies, there is a real substantial presence of Christ in sensible forms for the very purpose of grace.

St. Paul, in this incident of the sacramental communion of Israel in the pre-existent Christ, raises our minds to higher and broader conceptions of the whole problem, for we must, from this point of view, think that Christ did not first become a victim and priest when he was recognised by God and consecrated at his baptism. He was already priest and victim in his pre-existent state. The Apocalypse tells of the "Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world";[2] and St. Peter says that we were redeemed

> with precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and without spot [even the blood] of Christ: who was foreknown, indeed, before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times. (I Peter i. 18–20.)

[1] Ex. xvi.-xvii.; xl. 34-38; Nu. xx. 1-13; Ps. cv. 39-41.
[2] Rev. xiii. 8.

As my teacher and friend, Roswell D. Hitchcock, said:

> The agony of God over human sin is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. God Himself atones, to Himself atones; and so, atonement is both eternal and divine. (*Eternal Atonement*, p. 11.)

Christ as the son of God, the archetypal man,[1] was the divinely appointed victim from all eternity, and as such the accepted sacrifice, the pledge, the guarantee of the eventual complete redemption of mankind. And so in the sacrificial system of the Old Testament there was a feeding upon Christ, unconscious, it is true, but none the less real; as Israel was in preparation for the advent of the victim clothed in flesh, who passed through the experience of an earthly sacrificial victim, that all mankind might realise, as they could in no other way, the real significance of sacrifice in a suffering and glorified Saviour. And so the ancient thought of the Jewish philosopher, Philo, is also true, that the Logos in his very being, as the mediator between God and the creature, was essentially the one, eternal high priest, ever presenting himself as the world's gift to God, and also himself as God's gift to the world.

It is also true that the real altar and temple have always been in heaven in the immediate presence of God in Christ himself; and the ancient Scriptures are strictly true when they state that both tabernacle and temple and all their sacred places and furniture were constructed after heavenly models.[2] Their purpose was to interpret and make men realise the worth of the heavenly originals. And so Jesus Christ, as the one mediator between God and man, is always, as pre-existent, as ministering on earth, and as the risen and glorified redeemer, the one everlasting, everliving Priest-King, and the one perfect sacrifice, and the one comprehensive altar and temple, all in one personal, all-perfect Being. In all ages he was mediating as priest and sacrifice, sometimes manifesting himself in sensuous forms of Theophany, but always operative whether discerned or not; in the

[1] I Cor. xi.3. [2] Ex. xxv. 40; 1 Chr. xxviii. 11-19.

midst of the world's history he became incarnate to identify himself more closely with man and nature; then passing through the experience of human life and death, he glorified human nature; and henceforth mediates as priest and sacrifice, as the God man, manifesting himself in Christophanies, but always again operative whether discerned or not. And the chief manifestation of himself is ever in the Holy Communion, which may be regarded as Christophanic in character, and, in a sense, a perpetuation of the Incarnation in the life and experience of the Church.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS UPON THOSE WHO USE THEM

The questions already considered cannot be entirely answered, until we have studied the final question as to the effect of the Sacraments upon those who use them. Here again, for lack of space, we must confine ourselves to the Holy Eucharist. We have seen that it is by eating and drinking the elements of bread and wine that the effects of this most holy Sacrifice are produced in the communicants. The differences in the Christian Churches are very great just here.

The serious question is, whether when we take the sacred elements into the mouth, and into the stomach, we also take with them the body of Christ. Involved in this is the further question, whether unbelievers also partake, and if so, in what sense. The Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Greek, and Oriental Churches affirm, but the Calvinists deny these things. We shall not, however, expend our strength upon this side of the question, because it leads to no solution of the difficulties of the problem, and the only interest any one has in maintaining it is its supposed logical necessity. The real question is how we may eat and drink the spiritual substance of the body and blood of Christ. All admit that it is not a sensuous eating and drinking, with taste, mastication and di-

gestion. These sensuous acts have to do only with the species or the elements, not the body of Christ. What, then, is the nature of this eating and drinking if it is not sensuous? It can only be a spiritual eating, because the substance is spiritual substance. The Roman Catholics and Lutherans insist upon a real eating and drinking, carefully to be distinguished from faith. The Calvinists, when they assert that the eating is by faith, do yet, as we have seen, hold that the eating is action additional to faith.[1]

The Ecstatic State

As we have used the Theophany to guide us as to the nature of the presence, so we may use the ecstatic state to guide us to the nature of the eating. In the ecstatic state men lose consciousness of the material world about them and become conscious of spiritual realities. This is, in a measure, true also of the dream and of all hypnotic conditions. In the ecstatic state the sensible nature is no longer operative, but the imagination and the memory are chiefly at work; and yet we see and hear, taste and smell, and touch as distinctly, and often more so, than we do with our sensible nature. Is this all the work of the imagination or fancy? Is it illusion or delusion? or is there substantial reality in this experience? We may distinguish in this experience, which is now commonly summed up under the term suggestion, between self-suggestion and suggestion by others than ourselves, for both of these are matters of common experience. It is evident that, while auto-suggestion plays an important part in dreams, the ecstatic state and other hypnotic conditions, there are many instances in which suggestion from others than ourselves also plays an important part. It is the latter alone with which we now have to do.

In the ecstatic state men see persons and things, hear words and sounds, taste and smell and touch various objects. These objects, discerned in the ecstatic condition, are usually

[1] See pp. 265 *f.*

not material things, because there is no actual contact of the senses with matter; but they are the substances of things. This is the state in which much of ancient prophecy was received. It is the state into which Jesus and St. Peter and St. Paul, and after them a multitude of holy men and women in all ages, have not infrequently passed when they would become absorbed in spiritual realities, undisturbed by the affairs of ordinary life. The ecstatic state and the Christophany are not infrequently combined in the Scriptures. Indeed, the ecstatic state seems to be the most appropriate condition in which a man may receive Theophanies. Such Theophanies should not be regarded as unreal because given to men in the ecstatic condition. They may be all the more real, in that such men may be able to discern them so much the better in that state. Certainly, the Biblical worthies who enjoyed this high privilege regarded them as real, and represented them as realities. We cannot think that God would permit the leaders of His religion to be so greatly deceived. If the presence in the Holy Communion is essentially Christophanic, the experience of enjoying that presence may be ecstatic.

There can be no doubt that the ecstatic state has often been enjoyed by holy men and women at the Eucharist; and in such a state we should not be surprised if they have seen the Lord in some of the many forms of his manifestation. But this is not the usual experience, and is not to be regarded as a normal one. We mention it here in order that it may help to understand what is meant by eating and drinking by the spiritual nature, as something really distinct from faith, though dependent upon it. In the ecstatic state, the subconscious nature comes into consciousness, and the ordinary conscious nature becomes unconscious. But the subconscious nature continues to exist even if it be subconscious, and it continues its activity even if we are not conscious of it. Therefore, we may say, that at the Holy Communion there may be a subconscious feeding upon Christ in the elements, even if we are not conscious of that feeding, except so far as

the exercise of faith and the religious memory and imagination are concerned; and so the blessed effects of the Holy Communion may be unconsciously enjoyed even by the most ignorant. The presence of Christ and his benefits do not depend upon the measure of our consciousness of them. It is an objective presence in the elements which communicates itself to us by means of our faith, and feeds us with the body and blood of Christ, even if we are not conscious of the exact way in which we are fed.

In that respect we are simply babes in Christ; and, in fact, the Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Calvinist, however different their theories and explanations may be, when they take the elements of the Holy Communion into the mouth, do not practically differ in their religious experience.

The Preservation of Body and Soul

Whatever may be the opinion of the Churches as to the nature of the feeding, they agree, Lutheran and Calvinist, Greek and Roman, that the feeding upon Christ in the Eucharist is not simply a benefit to the soul of man, but also to his body. They all agree that the body and blood of Christ therein partaken "preserve the body and soul unto everlasting life."

Calvin says;

> Christ is obtained not only when we believe that he was made an offering for us, but when he dwells in us, when he is one with us, when we are members of his flesh (Eph. vi. 30), when, in fine, we are incorporated with him, so to speak in our life and substance. For he does not simply present to us the benefits of his death and resurrection, but the very body in which he suffered and rose again. (Com. on I Cor. xi. 24–26.)

And at the Conference of Poissy in 1561, Beza, Peter Martyr and other Protestant representatives agreed with the Roman Catholic representatives in this common platform:

> We confess that Jesus Christ in the Holy Supper gives us and imparts truly the susbtance of his body and blood through the operation of

the Holy Spirit, and that we take and eat sacramentally and by faith this proper body that died for us, in order to become bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, and thereby receive life. (*Histoire critique des projets formes depuis trois cent ans pour la Reunion des Communions*, p. 184.)

There is, indeed, in mankind as in Christ a body, whose form and substance are not dependent upon the material of which it may be composed, which will continue to exist after this material body becomes dust, in a spiritual body suited to the intermediate state, and in the resurrection body suited to the final state. The form and essential substance of this body remain always the same, the temporary material of which it may be composed depending upon the circumstances and the conditions of its state of existence. This is the body that underlies our sensuous body, and which alone is capable of transformation into the spiritual, incorruptible, heavenly and glorious body with which we shall be clothed in the future state. It is this body whose appetite can only be satisfied with the body of Jesus Christ our Lord. It is this body which feeds upon him in the Holy Communion. It is this body which is thereby assimilated to his heavenly body and is preserved unto everlasting life.

X

CHURCH AND CREED

CHURCH and Creed were born together. The Creed is essentially a confession of faith in Jesus Christ as the Messiah and Saviour of men. St. Peter may be said to have uttered the first Christian creed when he said: "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God."[1] On this account he was named by the Messiah the rock of the Church. The first confessor was given the keys of the kingdom of God. The creed was at first that confession of faith in the Messiah which was necessary to Christian baptism and to participation in the supper of the Lord in the Church. The apostolic commission, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,"[2] gave the outline of the Trinitarian Creed: "I believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

So soon as the Church was organised, and provision was made for the training of converts in preparation for the Sacraments, this simple outline of the creed was enlarged, so as to embrace the essential doctrines of the Christian religion as conceived by the ancient Church. This enlargement of the creed was made independently in the different churches established in the provinces and cities of the Roman Empire; but gradually a consensus was attained, such as we find in the so-called Apostles' Creed.

I. THE APOSTLES' CREED

The Apostles' Creed was so named, not because of the legend that it was composed by the apostles, as some have supposed, but because, like the *Didache, the Didascalia*, and

[1] Mt. xvi., 16. [2] Mt. xxviii. 19. See pp. 102 *f.*

the Constitution of the Apostles, it was supposed to give the apostolic tradition of the Church. We have to distinguish a gradual growth of the Creed from its earlier forms to its present accepted form as used in the Western Churches. The earliest form thus far known is the old Roman Creed, of the middle of the second century, chiefly attested by Irenæus and Tertullian. We then have a revised form of the middle of the fourth century, chiefly attested by Rufinus and Marcellus of Ancyra. Several later forms may be distinguished before the present stereotyped form came into universal use in the West. I shall place the earliest and latest forms side by side for comparison. There is some difference of opinion as to the precise words of the old Roman form. I can only give that form which seems to me the earliest yet attainable, as the results of my own investigations, fully explained in my unpublished lectures.

I BELIEVE

Earliest form	Present form
1. In one God, the Father, Almighty;	1. In God, the Father, Almighty, maker of heaven and earth;
2. And in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord;	2. And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord;
3. The one born of Mary the Virgin;	3. Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary
4. The one under Pontius Pilate crucified and buried;	4. Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;
5. On the third day risen from the dead,	5. He descended into Hades, the third day he rose again from the dead;
6. Ascended into heaven,	6. And ascended into heaven,
7. And seated on the right hand of the Father;	7. And sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father, Almighty;
8. Thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead,	8. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

9. And in the Holy Ghost;	9. And I believe in the Holy Ghost,
10. The Holy Church,	10. The Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints,
11. The forgiveness of sins,	11. The forgiveness of sins,
12. The resurrection of the flesh.	12. The resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

II. THE NICENE CREED

The Nicene Creed also has passed through several revisions. The original Nicene Creed was prepared by the Council of Nice in 325. Constantine, the first Christian emperor, summoned it. It was composed of 318 bishops, all Eastern except Hosius, of Corduba, in Spain. It was called to settle the Arian controversy. When the Council assembled it was found that there were few that sympathised with Arius. But a considerable number, under the leadership of Eusebius of Cæsarea, took an intermediate position between the two parties and wished no further definition of the Faith than that contained in the local Creeds. However, the majority were zealous against the Arians and prepared for extreme measures. Eusebius presented to the Council a Creed which, he said, "he had learned as a catechumen, professed it at his baptism, taught it in turn as presbyter and bishop, and that it was derived from our Lord's baptismal formula."[1]

The Council took this Creed as satisfactory so far as it went, and made it the basis for its formula, but added several phrases aimed against the Arians, which were not altogether satisfactory to the Eusebians, who, however, managed to interpret them in their own sense.

The battle with Arianism continued throughout the century with great violence and varying fortunes. Although the Roman Church was not represented at Nice, it at once adopted its formula and maintained its position through thick and thin. In the East, the intermediate party was strong, especially in Syria. At Antioch a number of provincial councils were held, the most important of which was

[1] Epistle to the people of Cæsarea.

the Council of the Dedication, in 341, which adopted the Lucian Creed, which it was claimed was the Creed of Antioch composed by the martyr Lucian and based upon an older baptismal formula. The intermediate party were eager to affirm the older local Creeds over against the new Creed of Nice. The intermediate party grew stronger and stronger until at last they made an alliance with the stricter adherents of the Nicene formula, and the result was the Constantinopolitan Creed.

The Council of Constantinople was convoked by the Emperor Theodosius in 381 and composed of 150 bishops, all Eastern. Their first canon readopted the Nicene Creed and condemned the Arians. The Constantinopolitan Creed is in the present text of the Acts of that Council, but it is not known how it came there. The Council of Chalcedon definitely asserts that the Constantinopolitan Creed was the symbol of the 150. It is altogether probable, therefore, that in some sense it was before that Council and approved by that Council, although it is improbable that it was formally adopted, for the Council seems to have simply reaffirmed the Nicene Creed.

The situation at Nice was repeated. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose orthodoxy was questioned by some, presented to the Council of Constantinople the Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, which had revised the older Creed of that Church by the insertion of the Nicene formula, with the exception of a few phrases. This revised Creed of Jerusalem was well known to Epiphanius who gives it in 374 in his work, ὁ Ἀγκορωτός. He had brought it with him from Jerusalem, in the vicinity of which he had long lived till 367, when he became bishop in Cyprus.

However the mystery of its connection with the Council of Constantinople may be explained, it is certain that this Creed, known as the Constantinopolitan, is really a combination of the older baptismal Creed of Jerusalem with the Nicene Creed, and that it was recognised by the Council of Chalcedon as the symbol of the 150 bishops of Constantinople,

and that it was given œcumenical authority by its adoption by the Council of Chalcedon; and so being an expansion of the Nicene Creed and containing several important statements of the Faith, not in the Nicene Creed but in the old Roman Creed and other baptismal Creeds, it eventually took the place of the original Nicene Creed, and became itself in use the Œcumenical Nicene Creed.

The received form of the Western Church differs from the original and Eastern forms of the Constantinopolitan, by the addition to the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, of "and the Son;" and by the restoration from the original Nicene Creed of the clause, "God of God." Both of these appear for the first time in the recital of the Creed at the Council of Toledo in 589, although they are found in earlier documents. The phrase "and of the Son" probably came into the Creed from the original form of the so-called Athanasian Creed, which originated in Gaul and which attained a high degree of authority in the West, but not in the East. These additions, however important they may be, can hardly be regarded as having œcumenical authority, and ought to be removed in the interest of the Reunion of Christendom.

The Athanasian Creed is orthodox in doctrine, but it is too dogmatic in form and language for a Creed, and its damnatory phrases are offensive to many modern Christians. It should no longer be used in public worship.

The original Nicene Creed and the later Constantinopolitan are given below, the differences being indicated by italics.

WE BELIEVE

Nicene Creed	Constantinopolitan Creed
1. In one God, the Father, Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible;	1. In one God the Father Almighty, maker *of heaven and earth and* of all things visible and invisible;
2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only be-	2. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the, only begotten, Son of God, begotten of the Fath-

gotten; *that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God,* Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made *both in heaven and on earth;*

3. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man,

4. He suffered,

5. And the third day he rose again,

6. Ascended into heaven.

8. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead;

9. And in the Holy Ghost.

er *before all worlds,* Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made;

3. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down *from heaven* and was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,* and was made man,

4. He *was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and* suffered, *and was buried;*

5. And the third day he rose again *according to the Scriptures,*

6. *And* ascended into heaven,

7. *And sitteth on the right hand of the Father;*

8. From thence he shall come *again with glory,* to judge the quick and the dead; *whose kingdom shall have no end;*

9. And in the Holy Ghost, *the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets;*

10. *In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.*

11. *We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.*

12. *We look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.*

The Apostles' Creed has been a baptismal Creed from the beginning; the Nicene Creed is a conciliar Creed, an official Œcumenical Creed. Although in the East it incorporated the earlier baptismal Creed, and so became itself a baptismal Creed; it is more properly a Creed for the matured Christian, and has been used in the East as well as in the West as most appropriate for the Holy Communion. The Apostles' Creed was a Creed the acceptance of which was necessary for baptism and for incorporation into the Church. The Nicene Creed was a test of orthodoxy and necessary for full communion in the Church.

The damnatory clauses of the Nicene Creed I have not given. They ought never to have been used with the Creed. They may be appropriate as the judgment of the Council, but they are not proper in public worship. These two primitive Creeds have been taken into the Liturgies of the Christian Church and are a part of the public worship of Christendom.

The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and the Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Church of England and her daughters, did wisely when in their plan for the reunion of Christendom they proposed these two liturgical Creeds—"the Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith." It should be the aim of all Christians to rally about this position as the essential doctrinal basis of Christendom. These two Creeds are suited to public worship in form and in substance. Their language is chaste and beautiful, they are devotional and easily become choral. The Christian world, with very few exceptions, heartily unites in them, and in the one harmonious Faith realises the blessedness of "the communion of saints." The later decrees, articles and confessions of the Church express division and schism. They set forth doctrinal variations which are of great importance in the science of Theology, but which are not essential to Christian faith and life. The formula of Chalcedon and the pseudo-Athanasian Creed are accepted by the great body of orthodox men in the Christian

Church, but both of them have been severely criticised by devout and honoured theologians. What they have added to the two ancient Creeds has not tended to the harmony of Christendom. The Synod of Orange, in the West, decided for a mild Augustianism, but this and the later decisions of Popes and Councils did not assume creedal forms.

III. SYMBOLS OF FAITH

The Church of Christ for 1,500 years lived and grew and accomplished its greatest triumphs, destroying the ancient religions, transforming the Greek, Roman and Oriental civilisations, winning the Celtic, Germanic and Slavonic races to Christ, without any other Creeds than these. But in the sixteenth century the throes of liberty and reformation divided the Church, and large numbers of decrees, articles, catechisms and confessions of faith were framed in order to define the differences and to emphasise the discord of Christendom. The Greek Church produced a number of confessions and catechisms to vindicate its orthodoxy over against Rome and Wittenberg. The Protestant Churches set forth their Faith in the Augsburg Confession and in national symbols. The Roman Catholic Church defined the orthodox Faith in the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent. All the variations of Protestantism also found expression in confessions of Faith and in catechisms of various kinds. These modern symbolical documents differ greatly in form and character from the ancient Creeds. 1. They are not so much Creeds, expressing the real Faith of the people of God, as systems of orthodox doctrine to be taught by theologians. 2. They are not designed for the worship of the people and are therefore not in the liturgical form. They are for instruction in the class-rooms; catechisms for children, larger catechisms for adults, and confessions of faith for the ministry. 3. They do not set forth in plain terms the essential doctrines of Christianity, but in learned language they give a complete exposition of Christian doctrine, or else a full statement of certain

particular doctrines with regard to which there has been division and debate.

If it was necessary to organise the various Protestant national Churches of Northern Europe, it was also necessary that these Churches should define their Faith in symbolical books. This made it necessary also for the Roman Catholic Church to define its position at the Council of Trent. So also when the non-conforming Churches separated from the national Churches there was the same historic necessity for additional symbols of Faith. These symbolic books were designed for the most part as public expressions of the Faith of the national Churches or the denominations using them. They were not ordinarily intended to bind the consciences of the people, or even to compel the ministry to blind subscription to all their dogmatic statements. Subscription to Articles and Confessions was forced on the British Churches by the authority of the State, in the interests of civil order.[1] It was not a natural evolution of Protestantism itself. It was rather an unwholesome check to the development of Protestantism in its doctrine and life. The symbolic books of Protestantism culminated on the Continent of Europe in the Lutheran Form of Concord and in the Reformed Canons of Dort. The Form of Concord became a form of discord in the Lutheran Churches. Dr. Schaff has well said:

> During the palmy period of Lutheran scholasticism, the Formula of Concord stood in high authority among Lutherans, and was even regarded as inspired. Its first centennial [1680] was celebrated with considerable enthusiasm. But at the close of another century it was dead and buried. (*Creeds of Christendom*, p. 336.)

The Canons of Dort excluded Arminianism from the reformed Churches, and made a division which has continued until the present time. Dr. Schaff says:

> The Canons of Dort have for Calvinism the same significance which the Formula of Concord has for Lutheranism; both betray a very high order of theological ability and care. Both are consistent and necessary developments. Both exerted a powerful and conserving influence in these

[1] See p. 185.

Churches. Both prepared the way for a dry scholasticism which runs into subtle abstractions, and resolves the living soul of divinity into a skeleton of formulas and distinctions. Both consolidated orthodoxy at the expense of freedom, sanctioned a narrow confessionalism, and widened the breach between the two branches of the Reformation. (*Ibid.*, p. 515.)

The Westminster Confession was later than the two scholastic symbols just mentioned. It was the fruit of the second Reformation in Great Britain, and as such, full of life and vigour and thereby less scholastic than the Formula of Concord and the Canons of Dort. But in some respects, it is having a history similar to that of these two older symbols. As I have elsewhere said:

It was a splendid plan to unite all parties in the three national Churches of Great Britain about common symbols. But, unfortunately, the king would not allow the episcopal divines to attend, and the Assembly, with the Long Parliament, soon expelled the episcopal party. The Presbyterian majority was intolerant toward the Congregational minority, so that, while the dissenting brethren struggled heroically for their views in the Assembly, the hostility of the Presbyterian party became so great that John Goodwin and Henry Burton, the only two pastors of London churches who were Independents, were deprived of their charges. And so the Westminster Symbols became the banners of the Presbyterian party. What, then, do we see at the present time? The Westminster Confession has been rejected by all of the historical Churches of England. It is held only by the Presbyterian Church of England, a small Church composed chiefly of Scottish and Irish families residing in England. In Ireland, it is the symbol only of the Presbyterians of the North. It is a national confession in Scotland alone. It is used only by Presbyterians in America and the colonies. Nine-tenths of the Protestants of Great Britain and America do not adhere to the Westminster Confession. It has failed in its design of displacing the Thirty-nine Articles. It has not become the one Faith of Great Britain. This is the verdict of history on the Westminster Confession. (*How Shall We Revise?* pp. 4–5.)

IV. REVISION OF SYMBOLS

The revisions of the Westminster symbols, and of the terms of subscription thereto, now in progress in the Presbyterian Churches of the world, will probably eventually result in casting them aside as barriers to Church Unity, and as no longer suitable expressions of the Faith and Life of the Church in our day.

Dogmatic theology is in a state of dissolution and reconstruction. The dogmatic theologians have elaborated Protestant dogma far beyond the later symbolical books of Protestantism. Thinking men are going back to the symbols of the Reformation, and then back of these to the Œcumenical Creeds, and then still further back to the theology of the Bible itself. The theology of the Bible was sadly neglected by the scholastic divines, and it has found no adequate expression in the symbolical books of any of the great Churches of Christendom. They, for the most part, pursued false methods of exegesis. They knew little or nothing of Biblical Criticism. The lower or textual Criticism, the higher or literary Criticism, and historical Criticism, are sections of modern scientific study of the Bible. Criticism has made the Bible a new book. And the discipline of Biblical Theology which builds on the results of Criticism finds in the Bible a new theology—new not in the sense that it destroys anything that is valuable in the old theology, but, on the one hand, simpler, fresher, full of life and energy, quickening, and fascinating people as well as preacher; and, on the other hand, more comprehensive, more profound, more symmetrical and harmonious. It is sublime and indeed divine, because it brings us face to face with holy prophets and with God himself. The old scholastic dogmatics, in which the most of the ministry now in service have been trained, and which they have been taught as the rule of faith by which to interpret Bible and History, Christian experience and human life, is now confronted by a Biblical Theology that convicts it of exaggeration in human speculation, of misinterpretation of the Word of God, and of ignorance of some of the most important facts and teachings of the Scriptures. Biblical Theology has made it evident that the dogmatic systems have obscured the Biblical elements with the ecclesiastical and the speculative, and have thereby as Pharisaism of old made the Word of God void because of tradition.[1]

Historical Theology has undermined and destroyed, in

[1] Mt. xv., 6.

large measure, the ecclesiastical claims of the dogmaticians. We now know well the history of doctrine and the history of dogma. The story of creed-formation in the early Church, and the controversies resulting in the construction of the symbolical books of the modern Churches, have for the most part been made evident by the historical investigation of their sources. The claims of authority, that were strong when these Creeds and symbols were enveloped with a halo of mystery, which made them appear as wellnigh inspired, can no longer resist the evidences of human passions and strifes, the false use of Scripture and History, the improper methods of argumentation, the errors in philosophy and psychology, that to such an extent influenced the authors of the symbols in their doctrinal definitions. We have learned to distinguish (1) Biblical Theology, (2) the history of dogma, (3) the doctrine of the Creeds, (4) the speculations of the dogmatic theologians.

The systems now in use in the United States, for the most part, were constructed without any use whatever of the more fundamental departments of theological science; and yet in childlike simplicity and cool dogmaticism it is assumed that they are Biblical, churchly and confessional. When the dogmas of the Churches are tested by the Bible and by History, they do not sustain the test well enough to resist the demands for revision and for new and simpler Creeds. I have fully shown that the Churches subscribing to the Westminster Confession have widely drifted from it in the teaching of their leading theologians and in the preaching of the pulpits.

The Westminster system has been virtually displaced by the teachings of the dogmatic divines. It is no longer practically the standard of the Faith of the Presbyterian Church. The catechisms are not taught in our churches, the confession is not expounded in our theological seminaries. The Presbyterian Church is not orthodox, judged by its own standards. It has neither the old orthodoxy nor the new orthodoxy. It is drifting toward an unknown and a mysterious future. (*Whither?* pp. 223–4.)

I have also shown in another place by a comparative table of the Westminster Confession and two of the leading dogmatic systems of recent times that the proportions of the Faith, set forth in the Westminster Confession, have entirely changed.

New doctrines have come into the field, old doctrines have been discarded; some doctrines have been depressed, other doctrines have been exalted. The systems are different in their structure, in their order of material, in the material itself, in its proportions, and in the structural principles. The essential and necessary articles of about one half of the Westminster system are in these systems, but the other half, with its essential articles, is not there. (*How Shall We Revise?* p. 11.)

I have also shown from a table of all the proof texts of the Westminster Confession that 667 texts are from the Epistles of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and only 248 from the Gospels and 247 from the other writers of the New Testament.

Thus the Confession is built on the words of Paul rather than the words of the Lord Jesus. It is Pauline rather than comprehensively Christian. . . . There are so many omissions of important doctrines of Holy Scripture, there is such a disproportionate use of the darker and gloomier side of the Bible, and such a neglect of the brighter and more gracious side, and there is such a difference between the Confession and the preaching of the pulpit and the reading of the Bible in our homes, that something more than revision will be required to meet the necessities of the case, and we must set our faces toward the new creed as the only adequate solution of the difficulties of the situation. (*Ibid.*, pp. 139, 181–2.)

The Westminster Confession having already been displaced by dogmatic systems, these will give way to new systems constructed on more scientific principles and in closer harmony with the Bible and History. Such systems will distinguish between the essential and the non-essential in Christian doctrine, and thus prepare the way for a consensus Creed, expressing the essential doctrines in the forms suitable for public worship, reserving the non-essential doctrines for the discussion of the class-room, the lecture, the treatise, and the ministers' club.

The Church of England and her daughters no longer regard belief in the entire body of the Articles of Religion as essential to Christian ministerial work. The Methodists have reduced these Articles to a simpler form and are not rigid in the acceptance of them. The Congregational Churches no longer insist upon the Savoy Declaration or the Cambridge platform. The Baptist Churches have no common Confession of Faith that binds them, but at most simple congregational Creeds. The Protestant Churches of the Continent have for the most part laid aside the symbols of the Reformation. Where this has not been formally done by official action, it has been really accomplished by common consent. There is a general tendency throughout Protestant Christendom toward simple statements of Faith and a general acquiescence in the old Œcumenical Creeds as sufficient even for our times.

There have been great advances in doctrine and in dogma in modern theology. The dogmatic divines have generally laid more stress on the new doctrines than on the old ones. A recent study of the Apostles' Creed, in comparison with several systems of dogmatic theology in general use at the present time, showed that six of the articles of the Creed (1, 2, 3, 4, 11 and 12) are elaborated in more or less fulness in the dogmatic systems; that six of them (5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10) have been to a great extent ignored, and that there are six doctrines not in the two ancient Creeds to which the two representative dogmatic systems of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. W. T. Shedd give twice the attention that they have to the 12 articles of the Creeds. Those doctrines that have risen into so great importance as to suppress the ancient Catholic doctrines of the Church are: (1) inspiration of the Scriptures, (2) the divine decree, (3) original sin, (4) vicarious atonement, (5) imputation of the righteousness of Christ, (6) everlasting punishment. This group of doctrines is just where the Church is divided. These have been exaggerated in their importance, while doctrines in which there is concord are passed over lightly or else entirely over-

looked. The tendency of American dogmatic speculation has been in one direction, while the tendency of the Faith of the home and the pulpit has been in another direction; so that a crisis has been reached and a break has come between a so-called conservative dogmatic theology, which is really radical in its elaboration of speculative dogma, and the Faith and life of the Church, which adheres to the simpler statements of the Bible and to the ancient Creeds.

The tendency of thought in the present century has been toward the person and work of Jesus Christ. This urges a return to the ancient Christological Creeds. The life of Christ has been studied as never before. The doctrine of the incarnation has again become prominent. More attention is now given to the doctrine of the resurrection, enthronement and second advent of our Lord. This tendency is becoming stronger every year; it will eventually become so powerful that all modern doctrines will be Christologised, and then it will be possible to put them, in their essential contents, into the devotional form, and to introduce them into the liturgical worship of the Church.

The Reformation did not go on to its completion. It came to a halt too soon. It over-emphasised justification and neglected sanctification; it exaggerated faith and depreciated holy love and good works. It threw away purgatory and left the middle state between death and the resurrection a blank. It is now clear to the historical critic that there is one-sidedness in Protestantism as well as in Roman Catholicism; that neither of these great religious bodies is to conquer the other; and that a reconciliation can take place only by each overcoming its own defects and becoming more comprehensively Christian.

Modern critical Philosophy, Science in all its branches, History, and the critical study of the Bible, are all working together to give the theologian treasures of truth unknown to former ages. The critical study of the Bible makes it a richer and a grander book, and finds mines of doctrines new as well as old. The Church, to the thoughtful student of history,

becomes sublime, notwithstanding all its defects, as the Kingdom of Christ on earth. The Reason, in the researches of modern Science and Philosophy, has become a vastly more potent factor in the apprehension and in the comprehension of divine truth. There is a reconciliation to be looked for, to be longed for and to be labored for, in the future, to which Churchman, Rationalist and Evangelical may each contribute. We may reasonably expect that the theological conflicts, the dissolutions of old theology, the reconstruction of new theology, the intense and eager researches after the truth of God, will result in a crisis in which all of the forces of Christianity will come into play in order to give birth to a new age of the world in which the discord of Christendom will die away, and concord will live and reign and express its new faith and new life in a Creed, a choral of praise to the triune God, in which all the essential doctrines of Christianity, learned from all the struggles and triumphs of twenty centuries, will be grouped about the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

XI

THE THEOLOGICAL CRISIS, ESPECIALLY IN AMERICA

THE Church of Jesus Christ was established on the day of Pentecost by the advent of the divine Spirit in theophany. The divine Spirit came in fulfilment of the promise of the Messiah himself. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth." [1] The divine Spirit came in order to remain in the Church as the counsellor and guide during the entire Messianic age until the second advent of the Son of God. Accordingly, when the Christian Church in all lands and in all ages has expressed its faith in the Holy Spirit, it has thereby confessed his presence and divine guidance in the Church. All that wonderful advance in Christian life and doctrine that transformed the ancient civilisations, conquered Celtic, Germanic and Slavonic races, and made Christianity the religion of the world, is an evidence of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

Progress in doctrine and life is a necessary experience of a living Church; and that progress will never cease until the Church attains its goal in the knowledge of all the truth, in a holiness reflecting the purity and excellence of Jesus Christ, and in a transformed and glorified world. Those holy men who were guided by the divine Spirit to found the Christian Church and build the first layers of its superstructure, have given sacred writings which must ever remain the rule of

[1] John xvi., 7, 13.

faith and life. Holy Scripture presents the ideal toward which the Church ever aims with earnest strivings. The Holy Spirit guides the Church in its appropriation of Holy Scripture, and this is ever a progressive knowing and a progressive practice, for Christian knowledge cannot advance far beyond Christian life.

I. THE ADVANCE OF THE CHURCH

Progress has always been confronted by conservatives and reactionaries. Jesus and Paul had a lifelong struggle with Pharisees. Every advance in Christian doctrine and the holy life has cost the heroic leaders agony and blood. But the advance has been made in spite of every opposition. The conservative and the progressive forces are in perpetual conflict. They wage a war that will reach its end only in the last triumph of Christ.

The progress of the Church is registered in symbolical books, liturgies, creeds, and canons of order and discipline. If the Church had submitted itself to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is possible that its progress would have been normal and its decisions would have been infallible. But, in fact, human forces have obstructed the free development of Christian doctrine and life. Human passion and strife, violence, oppression and crime, have too often given shape and colour to the decisions of Christian synods and councils; and therefore their decisions have mingled God's truth with human errors. We cannot rest with confidence upon the decrees of any ecclesiastical assembly.

As Duchesne well says:

> In the second century after several alarms, the gnostic crisis ended by calming itself entirely alone. Christianity had eliminated the morbid germs simply by the reaction of a vigorous organism. Later the modalist movement, after having agitated the churches a little everywhere, in Asia, at Rome, in Africa, in Cyrene and in Arabia, was gradually extinguished or confined. One had no need for council, nor emperor, nor symbols nor signatures. The quarrel of Origen and his Bishop, that began with much ardor, finished of itself. In that of Arius, great measures

were advanced. It only resulted in a short suspension of hostilities, followed by war, abominable and fratricidal, which divided entire Christendom from Arabia as far as Spain, and was only quieted after sixty years of scandal, that bequeathed to succeeding generations germs of schism from which the Church still suffers. (*Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*, II. p. 157.)

Rightly, then, the Westminster Confession teaches:

All synods and councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred. Therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both. (xxxi. 4.)

The ancient controversies that separated the Oriental Churches, and then the Greek Church from the Latin Church, were intensified by human passion and ambition. In all these controversies the doctrinal statements of the Latin Church were real advances in theology; but the unchristian conduct of the leaders of the Church brought on those unfortunate divisions which not only sacrificed the unity of the Church, but also gave Islam an easy victory over a distracted Christendom, and wellnigh yielded to it, the supremacy of the world.

The Latin Church was in throes of reformation for many generations before Luther and Zwingli. The stubborn resistance to the reforming spirit broke the Latin Church into pieces, and resulted in the formation of a number of national Churches over against the Church of Rome. These all defined their position in symbols of Faith in antagonism with all other parties. The three great principles of the Protestant Reformation were: 1. The authority of the Scriptures is supreme over the authority of the Church. 2. Men are justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by good works prescribed by the Church. 3. Men are saved by divine grace, and not by magical rites and ceremonies. These great principles of the Reformation gave new shape and colour to all other Christian doctrines that were looked at from the new point of view.

The reformers were men of great intellectual and moral vigor. Their doctrines were the expression of their Christian

life and experience. But they were succeeded by lesser men who gave their energies to the construction of systems of dogma. These soon enveloped the principles of the Reformation in a cloud of speculations and established a Protestant scholasticism, ecclesiasticism and ritualism, which seemed to earnest men little better than that which the reformers had cast aside. Accordingly a second reformation arose in Great Britain in the form of Puritanism, which reaffirmed and sharpened the principles of the Reformation and advanced toward a holy doctrine, a holy discipline and a holy life. The Puritan Reformation passed over to the Continent in the form of Pietism and transformed the Churches of Germany and Holland; but in Great Britain the Puritan became puritanical; and the choicest youth, driven from the British universities and educated in Switzerland and Holland, returned with a scholastic theology which soon took the place of the principles of Puritanism.

A third reforming movement arose with Wesley, Whitefield, Edwards and others, and the doctrine of regeneration and Christian experience became the prominent features of the new advance. But this regenerating force ere long became hardened into a cold and barren Evangelicalism.

All of these movements were due to the reviving influences of the divine Spirit, and each of them made marked advance in Christian theology and Christian life. Each advance, however, carried with it only a section of the Church, so that the Christian Church of our day, in its divisions, represents every stage of progress since the apostolic times. This should lead to the reflection that these advances, however important in themselves, have not been sufficiently comprehensive and essential to embrace the whole of Christendom. The great verities of the Christian religion are in the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds, wherein there is concord.

We stand upon the heights of the last of these great movements of Christendom. We accept all that has been gained in them all. But we recognise that each one of them in turn became exhausted and hardened and stereotyped in a

dead orthodoxy, owing to the reacting influences of conservatism and traditionalism. What is the gain if you substitute first, Protestant tradition for Roman Catholic, and then Puritan for Protestant, and finally Evangelical for Puritan? The advance is in the principles and in the essential features of the movement. We must distinguish between the essential and the non-essential. As soon as we do this, we see Christendom rising in a pyramid of grace, encompassed by tombs of dead theories and parties, and dreary wastes of human speculation; and we discern that there is but one platform for Christendom, the common consent in the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds. All else is in the sphere of Christian liberty. As Isaac Taylor once said:

> But thus it is, and ever has been, that those who are sent by heaven to bring about great and necessary movements, which, however, are, after a time, either to subside or to fall into a larger orbit, are left to the short-sightedness of their own minds, in fastening upon their work some appendage (perhaps unobserved) which, after a cycle of revolutions, must secure the accomplishment of heaven's own purpose—the stopping of that movement. Religious singularities are heaven's brand, imprinted by the unknowing hand of man, upon whatever is destined to last its season and to disappear. (*Wesley and Methodism*, p. 81.)

We have reached a period in which all the great movements have spent their force, and there is that confusion, agitation and perplexity which indicates the birth of a new movement that will absorb, comprehend and carry to loftier heights all that have preceded it. When all the *isms* have been broken off, the jagged edges of controversies will disappear, and Christian parties will fuse into a common brotherhood.

II. THE REAL ISSUES

No one can understand the issues involved in the present theological crisis unless he distinguish the three things: (1) The doctrine of Holy Scripture; (2) the doctrine of Creeds; (3) traditional dogma. In the evolution of Christian Theology the constant tendency is to overlay Scripture and Creed

with tradition. Every reforming movement must strip off the traditional dogmas from the Scriptures and present the genuine achievement of the Church as expressed in its official symbols apart from speculative elaborations. This is the real issue at the present time. There is a rally of dogmaticians and traditionalists against those Biblical and historical scholars who are aiming to dethrone tradition and put Holy Scripture and the Creeds in their proper position of authority in the Church.

It must be evident to every thinking man that the traditional dogma has been battling against Philosophy and Science, History and Literature, and every form of human learning. In this battle the Bible and the Creeds have been used in the interests of this dogma, and they and the Church have been compromised thereby. It is of vast importance, therefore, to rescue the Bible and the Creeds from the dogmaticians. There can be little doubt that the traditional dogma is doomed. Shall it be allowed to drag down into perdition with it the Bible and the Creeds? The dogmaticians claim that their dogma is in the Creed; if we do not submit to it we must leave the Church. They insist that their dogma is in the Bible, and if we do not accept it we must give up the Bible. Biblical scholars and historical students propose to do neither of these things; on the contrary, to hold up the Bible as the supreme authority for the Church; to build on the Creeds as the ecclesiastical test of orthodoxy. Traditional dogma is a usurper, and it will be dethroned erelong from its last stronghold.

Traditional dogma in the Protestant Reformed Churches is chiefly the scholastic Calvinism of Switzerland and Holland of the seventeenth century mingled with elements from the British Evangelicalism of the eighteenth century. But alongside of it is an apologetic based upon the Arminianism of Bishop Butler and an ethical philosophy of the nineteenth century. It is this internal strife between Calvinistic dogma, Arminian apologetics and Rationalistic ethics that has brought on the crisis in the Churches. Calvinistic dogma

has been wellnigh eliminated from the Congregational Churches. In the Presbyterian Churches, Semi-Arminianism demanded a revision of the Calvinistic sections of the Westminster Confession. The Calvinistic party in the Protestant Episcopal Church is a vanishing quantity. The Baptist Churches seem to be strong in their Calvinism, but there are signs of weakness in these also. But the battle between Calvinism and Arminianism is no longer of any practical importance to the Christian world. The vast majority of Christians have settled down into an intermediate position, just that which was determined centuries ago by the Synod of Orange (529), and which the Roman Catholic Church has held ever since. It may be important to Presbyterians to change the complexion of the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession, but such a change will have little or no influence upon the currents of modern theology.

The most important questions of our day are not determined in any of the Creeds of the Church, and are, therefore, beyond the range of orthodoxy. When the Church, in its official organs, decides these questions, then for the first time will they enter into the field of orthodoxy. Theological discussion at the present time is, for the most part, above and beyond the lines of denominational distinctions. All Christian theologians are engaged in them, without regard to sect or calling. They centre about three great topics: The First Things, Bible, Church and Reason; the Last Things, the whole field of Eschatology; and the Central Thing, the person and work of Jesus Christ, and the redemption through him.

III. THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

This was an essential question at the Reformation. It has been a fundamental doctrine ever since. There are three seats of Divine authority—the Bible, the Church and the Reason. Define Bible, Church and Reason as you may, in any case, God approaches men through each of them. The Christian Church is divided into three great parties—

Evangelicals, Churchmen and Rationalists. But there are many subdivisions of these parties, and not a few who take intermediate positions. The Churchmen make the Church supreme over Bible and Reason. The Evangelicals make the Bible supreme over Church and Reason. The Rationalists make the Reason supreme. The conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants since the Reformation leaves these two great parties in very much the same relative strength as at the close of the sixteenth century. Two hundred years have shown that the one is not to conquer the other. But in the meanwhile the Rationalistic party, which had but few adherents in the sixteenth century, has gained from Roman Catholic and Protestant alike. On the Continent of Europe, at least, it is wellnigh equal to either of the others. It seems altogether probable that neither party is to yield in the contest; there must be some way of reconciliation in a higher unity. All earnest men should strive after such a reconciliation.

The historian recognises that men have found God in the Bible, the Church and the Reason. If this be so, it is evident that those who use the three media of communication with God, and use them to the utmost, will be most likely to attain the highest degree of union and communion with God. It is the opinion of Christian scholars that Socrates and pure-minded heathen have ever found God in the forms of the Reason. Why should any deny that modern Rationalists, and seekers after God among the people, who are fenced off from Bible and Church by the exactions of priest and ecclesiastic, find God enthroned in their own hearts? The divine Spirit "worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth"; and though he ordinarily works through Bible and Church, yet when these channels of divine grace are obstructed by the rags of human dogmatism, or when by the neglect of the ministry they do not reach forth to the weak, the ignorant and destitute, the divine Spirit works without them in the enlightening and salvation of men. Where Holy Scripture does not work as a means of grace, the divine Spirit

may work now, as he worked before the Bible and the Church came into existence.

When I say that multitudes of Roman Catholics, Greek Christians, Orientals and churchmen of every name have found God through the Church, I agree with the Reformers in recognising these as Christians, and I do not deny the supremacy of the Scriptures. Where the Scriptures are withheld from the people by ecclesiastical authority, or where earnest seekers after God are driven from the Bible by the dogmas of traditional orthodoxy, how can the grace of God flow to them through the Scriptures? Those who restrain them from the Bible have the blame of keeping them from this gate of the Kingdom of God. The only ways of access left them are the Church and the Reason. And if they have not been taught to use the Reason as a means of access to God, God's Spirit will make the Church an avenue of grace. Each one of the channels of divine grace should be cleared of obstructions; each one should be made free and open to the use of man. Then, Holy Scripture will rise into acknowledged superiority over them all.[1]

IV. HOLY SCRIPTURE

The chief reason why men do not universally recognise the supremacy of Holy Scripture, is that the scholastics and traditionalists have thrust the Scriptures aside, have encased them in speculative dogma, and have used dogmatic theories of the Bible as a wall fencing off earnest, truth-seeking men. We present several of these dogmatic utterances.

The Presbyterian Church, in unison with all evangelical Christians, teaches that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, having been given by the immediate and plenary inspiration of God, are both in meaning and verbal expression the Word of God to man.

A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Scripture's claims, and therefore its inspiration in making those claims.

[1] See *Infallibility True and False*, viii. pp. 243 *f.*

Every book is genuine which was esteemed genuine by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written, and by the ages following, in a continued series.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned, those books, and those only, which Christ and his apostles recognised as the written word of God are entitled to be regarded as canonical. . . . The principle on which the canon of the New Testament is determined is equally simple. Those books, and those only, which can be proved to have been written by the Apostles, or to have received their sanction, are to be recognised as of divine authority.

If, as one asserts, "the great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names are lost in oblivion," it was written by uninspired men. . . . This would be the inspiration of indefinite persons like Tom, Dick and Harry, whom nobody knows, and not of definite historical persons like Moses and David, Matthew and John, chosen by God by name and known to men.

These are specimens of the statements of several dogmaticians of our day, and of traditional theories of the Bible that prevail among the ministry. They claim that inspiration is *verbal;* the Bible is *inerrant* in every particular; the *traditional* authors of the Biblical books must have written them; the canon accepted by the dogmaticians must be accepted by all. These statements are insisted upon as if they were orthodox, and yet in fact there is not a Creed in Christendom that indorses them; there is no Biblical authority for them; they are purely speculations and traditions, without any binding authority whatever. These dogmas confront a scientific study of the Bible.

1. The critical study of the Canon shows clearly that the Christian Church has never been in concord on this subject. The Roman Catholic Church follows the broader Canon of St. Augustine and the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. Protestants follow the stricter Canon of St. Jerome and the Jewish synod of Jamnia. But not a few of the writings of the stricter Canon were disputed by Jew and Christian. And the Christian writers of the ante-Nicene age used as Holy Scripture several writings which are not in the Augustinian Canon. The Roman Catholics build their Canon on the authority of the living historical Church.

The Reformers built their Canon upon the authority of the divine Spirit, speaking in Holy Scripture to the believer.

> We know these books to be canonical and the sure rule of our faith, not so much by the common accord and consent of the Church as by the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish them from the ecclesiastical books. (*Gallican Confession*, IV.)

The modern Rationalists test the Canon by the Reason. But modern Evangelicalism builds not on the judgment of the nineteenth century, but the judgment of the seventeenth century; not on the authority of the living Church, but on the authority of the dead Church. It has abandoned the internal divine evidence of canonicity, and destroyed the base of Protestantism. It builds on an uncertain, fluctuating tradition, and in that tradition selects the narrower rather than the broader line.

Textual Criticism destroys the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. Language is the vehicle, the dress of thought. Thought may find expression in any one of a thousand languages; it may be dressed in a great variety of synonyms, phrases and literary forms in any highly developed language. The form may vary indefinitely, and yet the meaning be essentially the same. The divine communication to the prophet's mind, and the inspiration to give it utterance by pen or tongue, does not necessarily carry with it the inspiration of the tongue in its utterances or the pen in its constructions. No Creed in Christendom teaches Verbal Inspiration.

I shall quote a few English divines of the seventeenth century, who had great influence in the formation of the Puritan faith.

> All language or writing is but the vessel, the symbol, or declaration of the rule, not the rule itself. . . . For it is not the shell of the words, but the kernel of the matter which commends itself to the consciences of men, and that is the same in all languages. . . . The Scripture stands not in *cortice verborum* but in *medulla sensus*, it is the same wine in this vessel which was drawn out of that. . . . The Scriptures in

themselves are a lanthorn rather than a light; they shine indeed, but it is *alieno lumine*—it is not their own, but a borrowed light. (Briggs' *Whither?* p. 66.)

These are testimonies of Lyford, Poole, Vines, and Wallis, among the most distinguished scholars of their time. They compare the words of Scripture to vessels, symbols, shells, wine-glass, lantern. The divine word is in the contents, the rule itself, the kernel, the wine, the light. Textual criticism finds no difficulty with these ancient divines and their doctrine of Inspiration. but it casts off the modern dogma of verbal inspiration as the shroud of divine truth, the grave-clothes of the Word of God.

3. The Higher or Literary Criticism on purely scientific principles determines the integrity, authenticity, literary forms, and credibility of the Scriptures. It works with the same rules that are used in every other department of the world's literature. These principles are: 1. The writing must be in accordance with its supposed historic position as to time, place and circumstances. 2. Differences of style imply differences of experiences and age of the same author, or, when sufficiently great, differences of author and period of composition. 3. Differences of opinion and conception imply differences of author when these are sufficiently great, and also differences of period of composition. 4. Citations show the dependence of author upon author, or authors cited. 5. Positive testimony. 6. The argument from silence.[1] The application of these rules to the scientific study of the Bible has shown that a large part of the traditions as to authorship, date, style and integrity have no solid ground. As I said some years ago in an Inaugural Address:

Traditionalists are crying out that it is destroying the Bible, because it is exposing their fallacies and follies. It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch or Job; Ezra did not write Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah; Jeremiah did not write Kings or Lamentations; David did not write the

[1] *Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 95 *sq.*

Psalter, but only a few of the Psalms; Solomon did not write the Song of Songs or Ecclesiastes, and only a portion of the Proverbs; Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. The great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names or connection with their writings are lost in oblivion. If this is destroying the Bible, the Bible is destroyed already. But who tells us that these traditional names were the authors of the Bible? The Bible itself? The Creeds of the Church? Any reliable, historical testimony? None of these! Pure conjectural tradition! Nothing more!" (*Authority of Holy Scripture*, p. 33.)

Higher Criticism cuts up the dogmatic theory of the Bible from the roots. If the traditional dogma be correct, Higher Criticism, for all who accept its conclusions, has destroyed the inspiration of a large part of the Bible. The dogmaticians, and those who follow them, must battle with Higher Criticism in a life-and-death struggle. They have identified Bible and Creed with their dogma, and they are risking everything on the issue of the struggle. But Higher Criticism has no difficulty in dealing with them. We ask them who wrote the orphan Psalms and the Epistle to the Hebrews. They cannot tell us. Are these books to go out of their Canon because they were written by "Tom, Dick and Harry," whom we do not know to be inspired? And even if we could find authors for all the Biblical books, how can we prove the inspiration of the writers except from the books? And yet we are asked to accept these very books because they were written by these inspired men. On such a vicious circle the dogmaticians build their faith.

Higher Criticism finds no more difficulty in accepting the inspiration of those great unknown poets who wrote the book of Job and the exilic Isaiah, than it does of the prophets Hosea and Micah, respecting whom there is no doubt. The Epistle to the Hebrews is as divine as the Epistle to the Romans; the name of Paul does not add a feather's weight to its authority. We determine the inspiration of the writer from the inspiration of the book, and we determine the inspiration of the book from its internal character and the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in it to the believer. The

same Holy Spirit, who guided holy men to produce the writings, gives assurance to those who use them that they are the Word of God.

The authority of the Holy Scriptures, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God. (*Westm. Conf.* I. 4.)

Inerrancy

4. The chief struggle between Biblical Criticism and the traditional dogma is about the question of inerrancy. No word of Holy Scripture, no sentence of historic Creed, makes this claim for the Bible. It is a theory of modern dogmaticians. Biblical Criticism finds errors in Holy Scripture in great numbers. These errors are in the circumstantials, and not in the essentials. They do not disturb any doctrine—they do not change the faith and life of the Christian Church. The great reformers, Calvin and Luther, recognised errors in the Scriptures; Baxter and Rutherford were not anxious about them. The greatest theologians of the Continent, Van Oosterzee, Tholuck, Neander, Stier, Lange, Dorner, Delitzsch, do not ignore them. Where is the German scholar of any rank who denies them? British scholars such as Ryle, Sanday, Cheyne, Driver, Gore, Davidson, Bruce, Dods; American scholars such as Schaff, Fisher, Thayer, Toy, Geo. Moore, Vincent, Harper, Smythe, H. P. Smith, Francis Brown, and hosts of others, frankly point them out.

It may be regarded as the consensus of Biblical scholars that the Bible is not inerrant; and yet certain dogmaticians insist that *one* error destroys its inspiration. They battle in death struggle for their dogma because their Bible shares in its defeat. They risk their whole Bible on a single error. One error in citation, one error in natural history, in astronomy, in geology, in chronology, destroys the whole Bible for them.

It is now generally admitted that there are errors in the

present text, but it is claimed that the original autographs as they first came from their authors were inerrant. But how can they prove this? It is pure speculation in the interest of their dogma. Criticism does not find the number of errors decreasing; they rather increase as we work our way back in the study of manuscripts, versions and citations, and advance in the critical analysis of the literature. It discredits the entire work of criticism to speculate as to another text than the best one we can get, after the most patient and painstaking study. It is certain that no original autograph was in the possession of the Church at the first or at any later stage of the determination of the Canon by the Church.[1]

Biblical Criticism pursues its work in a purely scientific spirit. It will detect, recognise and point out errors whenever it may find them in Holy Scripture. If the Reformers and Puritans, the great Biblical scholars of the past, have maintained their faith in the Bible, notwithstanding the errors they have seen in it, it is improbable that the Biblical critics of our day will be disturbed by them. If any one is disturbed, it will be those who have been misled by the dogmaticians to rest their faith on the doctrine of inerrancy. These will ere long find that doctrine a broken reed that will give them a severe fall and shock to their faith, if it does not pierce them to the heart with the bitter agony of perplexity and doubt.

5. The dogmaticians in their zeal for extending the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible beyond their proper sphere have altogether lost sight of the great purpose of Holy Scripture to "make men wise unto salvation." [2] Augustine's principle that "whatever cannot be referred to good conduct or truth of faith must be regarded as figurative," [3] however defective as a principle of interpretation, yet drew the line just where it ought to be drawn for the use of Holy Scripture by the Christian Church. This allegorical principle prevailed all through the Christian Church until the sixteenth

[1] *Study of Holy Scripture*, pp. 133 *sq.*
[2] II Tim. iii. 15.
[3] See p. 237.

century and in a large part of the Church since. It was the more scientific study of the Bible that brought moderns into trouble as regards questions of Inspiration and Inerrancy. The science of Biblical Interpretation has also dislodged not a few proof texts of old-fashioned systems of Divinity and destroyed numberless sermons. This in itself excites the hostility of large numbers of ministers to the newer exegesis. It has become evident that while the Bible is an infallible rule of Faith and Practice, it is not infallible in other spheres. The Bible is not an encyclopædia of all knowledge. No one goes to the Bible for instruction in Geology, Astronomy, Physics, Natural History, Civil Law, or Medicine. In all these departments the Bible is not inerrant, infallible, or even authoritative.[1] Those who have used the Bible for that purpose in the past, have obstructed the progress of Modern Science, and have committed grave mistakes to the great injury of the Bible and of Christianity.

6. The improvement in our knowledge of Biblical History, with its helps, Biblical Geography, Biblical Archæology and Biblical Chronology, has changed the face of the Bible. It has become evident that we cannot find infallibility in any of these departments as such. They present the same legendary, mythical and poetic sources as other ancient Historics, and have a similar proportion of errors. Historical Criticism is just as necessary in Biblical History as in any other History, to eliminate truth and fact from error and fiction. Here again we have to consider the purpose of the History as a History of redemption, to make men wise unto salvation. So far as the History fulfils this purpose it is infallible as a rule of faith and practice. Apart from this purpose, it has no more authority than any other History, save that we must takc account of it as the sacred envelope of the Holy substance, and as thereby made more truthful and reliable even in externals than ordinary History.

7. The most important department of recent Biblical Scicnce is Biblical Theology. Biblical Theology rests upon

[1] See p. 237.

Biblical Criticism. It has to determine the theology of each document by itself, then to compare the theologies of the documents and ascertain those things in which they agree, and those in which they differ. This work proceeds through the entire Bible, until at length the unity and variety of Holy Scripture is discerned and then set forth in its entirety. Biblical Theology traces the development of every doctrine, every form of religion and every phase of morals. Nothing is overlooked that is found in the Bible. Biblical Theology is the youngest of the daughters of Biblical Science. The writer was, if he mistake not, the first in this country to write upon the subject and to attempt a complete course of lectures upon it.

The study of Biblical Theology puts Dogmatic Theology to a severe test. In Germany it long since forced a reconstruction of dogmatics. The great systematic theologians of our time, such as Dorner, Martensen, Van Oosterzee, Müller, Kahnis, Ritschl, build upon it. But American dogmaticians have not studied it until recently. They persist in methods, lines of argumentation and a use of proof-texts which have long since been discarded in Europe. The present theological crisis is due largely to the resistance to Biblical Theology on the part of some dogmaticians and their pupils, representing the majority of the ministry who were trained under the old methods. They have been taught that Dogmatic Theology is only a systematic expression of the doctrine of the Bible.

But Biblical Theology makes it clear that these systems are chiefly speculative, and that if they were reduced to their Biblical dimensions their authors would hardly recognise them. Like a big orange, with thick skin and a mass of pulp, they yield little juice. These dogmatic systems neglect large masses of Holy Scripture, they depreciate some Biblical doctrines of great importance and exaggerate others of little importance, and so the whole face of Biblical doctrine is changed. Let any one study the proof-texts in the indexes of the favourite systems of dogma used in America, and he

will at once see the significance of what has been said. There is a capricious use of the Bible which is the reverse of systematic. There is a piling up of huge masses of dogma on a few innocent texts, and a brief mention of those comprehensive Biblical statements which Luther named little Bibles. I yield to no one in admiration of a true systematic theology such as those attempted by Henry B. Smith and Isaac A. Dorner, Martensen, Kahnis and Van Oosterzee. These theologians aim at a complete system built upon Philosophy and Science, Bible and History, Church and Creed. But those American dogmatic systems that depreciate the Reason, and then go to extremes in dogmatic speculation; that ignore Biblical Theology, and then search the Bible with a lantern for props for their dogmas; that turn their backs on the historical Church and institutional Christianity, and then chase every shadow of tradition that may seem to give them support, however feeble; such systems are but castles in the air, schoolboys' bubbles—the delight of a body of ministers in a period of transition, but without the slightest substantial contribution to the faith and life of the generations to come.

The Bible a Means of Grace

8. The most important thing about the Holy Scriptures is their use as the great means of divine grace. This has been recognised among the Jews and the Christians in all lands and in all Churches. The reading of Holy Scripture in the regular service of the Church, the cantillation of the Psalms, the prayers full of the language and thoughts of the Bible, the words of institution making the Sacraments effective, and the sermon which is essentially the preaching of the word of God—all this shows what the Bible has always been in the mind of the Christian Church. Now it is just this most important thing that dogmaticians have overlooked and neglected.

The Holy Scriptures were given with the purpose of salvation. The grace of salvation was breathed into them by

the divine Spirit. They contain that grace and convey it in their proper use. The Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."[1] This grace is not physical or magical, but religious and moral, conveyed by words. It is a power of suggestion, which invokes attention, and thereby, through the hearing of the ear, or the seeing of the eye, passes through these gates of the mind into the very soul itself.

The words of Holy Scripture that concern salvation are not mere words which contain cold, abstract, or even concrete, ideas for mere information or knowledge. They are living words having quickening power. Jesus said: "The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life."[2] They are, indeed, ever accompanied by the personal presence of the divine Spirit who makes them personal words from God to the human soul. The words of Holy Scripture are words of wisdom, "they make wise unto salvation";[3] which, in accordance with the Biblical use of wisdom, implies the making of the mind, affections and will all operative in wisdom. They illuminate the mind, kindle the torch of Truth which chases away the mists and clouds of error and gives the practical acquaintance with religious, holy and divine realities, and puts everything else in relation to them. They arouse the religious affections by the revelation of an affectionate God, whose love in religious experience warms into life and vigour a responsive love of gratitude, admiration and devotion. They make evident the eternal fitness of things by enabling us to see all things in the light of God and eternity, and so they impel with irresistible force to moral conduct, to the following of Jesus Christ in a holy and godlike life.

Salvation is the great ideal that pervades the Holy Scriptures as a holy thread binding all their parts together into a divine library of salvation. They give a history of salvation, the experiences of a multitude of holy men and women in the ways of salvation, and the precepts and divine impulses to salvation. By Holy Scripture we are convicted of sin, are

[1] Rom. i. 16. [2] John vi. 63. [3] II Tim. iii. 15.

invited to repentance, are assured of forgiveness, and are led to justification by faith and sanctification by love.

The Holy Scriptures are universal and eternal in their power of salvation. They aim at the salvation, complete, entire and perfect, of all mankind, the entire race of man. The Bible is an eternal book; it is old and yet ever new. To each succeeding generation it brings salvation. New light is ever breaking forth from the word of God and will ever continue so to do until the Holy Spirit has guided the Church into all the Truth.

The Church, in its official utterances in Creeds, Liturgies and Symbols of Faith, has wisely limited itself to stating the sure things, the important things about the Bible. Theologians should do the same. The time has surely come when they should cease exacting tithes of mint, anise and cummin [1] of the faith of God's people by exaggerating the doctrines of inspiration, inerrancy and the like, and limit themselves to the weightier matters that the Bible itself teaches, and the consensus of the Church, in its use of the Bible, requires.

V. LAST THINGS

The Last Things embrace Death, the Middle State, the Resurrection and the Messianic Judgment with its rewards and penalties. The Reformers rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, but did not state a Protestant doctrine of the Middle State. They concentrated their attention upon Justification by Faith at the beginning of the Christian life, they did not unfold the whole doctrine of Redemption. The field of Eschatology was left by them in a very obscure condition. They simply maintained the old Church doctrine after they had stripped off the supposed Roman-Catholic errors. They made no advance at this point. Great changes have taken place in the Christian world since the Reformation. The neglect of infant baptism and Church membership by the masses in Christendom, and the opening up of the heathen

[1] Mt. xxiii. 23.

world in numbers greatly exceeding the nominal Christian world, have compelled earnest men to ask the question how infants can be saved, and how the heathen, any of them, may be redeemed in accordance with the Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith. Increased attention to Christian Ethics and the doctrine of Sanctification has raised the question how men dying imperfect and unsanctified are to be sanctified. These questions are not answered by the Creeds. They have been considered only in a very inadequate way in the traditional dogma; they demand a more thorough investigation and scientific statement. The Christian world is agitated on all these questions, and the theological crisis is largely due to these discussions. There is great need of patience, charity, independent and fearless investigation, while they are in debate.

VI. THE MIDDLE STATE

The time has fully come when Protestant Churches are compelled to confront the question of the Middle State and the nature of Christian life therein. This crisis is due: (1) To an entire change of attitude toward the Second Advent of Jesus Christ; (2) to the spread in the churches of the Arminian doctrine of probation; (3) to the general acceptance of the new doctrine of the universal salvation of infants; (4) to the development of the doctrine of sin and guilt in connection with a further unfolding of Philosophical Ethics and a deeper study of Christian Ethics. In these four directions Protestantism, and especially Calvinistic Churches, have departed a long distance from the Creeds of the Reformation and the Confession and Catechisms of Westminster.

1. The doctrine of the Middle State depends chiefly upon the doctrine of redemption. All mankind are born into this world in a condition of sin and ruin. All need redemption. Redemption is born of *the love of God.* God is love. The love of God is the well-spring of election, predestination unto life, and all the acts and works of God for the accomplish-

ment of the redemption of man. It is a doctrine of scholastic Protestants that divine sovereignty is the source of the election. Some of these scholastic divines have gone so far, in their subordination of the divine love to the divine sovereignty, that they have pushed the love of God and the compassion of the heavenly Father behind the justice of the judge and the good pleasure of the sovereign, and thereby have come close to the unpardonable sin of limiting the grace of God and denying the power of the Divine Spirit. A genuine Protestantism, such as we find in the Symbols of the Reformation, teaches that God's election is an election of grace. The grace of God is so vast and inexhaustible that we may assume that God will redeem a larger number of our race than any man could suppose. God's love and power to save are infinitely greater than the love and redemptive yearnings of all creatures combined.

The love of God works redemption through Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world, and through the Holy Spirit, who imparts the new life and growth, without which salvation is impossible; and also through the paternal superintendence and government of the Heavenly Father. The redeemed consist, therefore, of those who belong to the elect of God, who have been purchased by Jesus Christ and who have been born of the Holy Spirit. The redeemed consist of the elect only. There can be no redemption that does not originate in the election of grace; in the love of the Heavenly Father's heart. The Reformers and Puritans apprehended the love of God and magnified the divine grace in election and predestination. That is the reason they made so much of these high doctrines. They also emphasised the doctrine of forgiveness of sins, which is so closely related to the doctrine of the divine grace. Scholastic divines, when they substituted sovereign election for the election of grace, divided mankind into two classes, those predestinated unto life and those predestinated unto everlasting death, and thus made both classes dependent upon the good pleasure of the will of the sovereign, without regard to their actual sins or acceptance of the provisions of

redemption. As a natural result of this theory the mass of mankind were doomed to everlasting perdition in hell fire, and only a few were snatched from the burning.

These scholastic divines also substituted God the Judge for God the Father, and accordingly overlooked the Fatherhood of God and abandoned the doctrine of forgiveness of sins. The supreme forms of this scholasticism were the supralapsarian theory, that made the decree of election and preterition prior to the decrees of the creation and the fall of man, and the kindred Antinomian theory, that made justification eternal and entirely independent of human faith and repentance. Such scholasticism had no need of a Middle State between Death and the Day of Judgment. It is hard to see what need there was of life in the present world. It is difficult for this theory to explain why God did not send men to heaven and hell at once in accordance with His arbitrary and eternal decree, which has no respect to life in this world and life after death, without requiring them to undergo a life and death which have no effect whatever upon their eternal welfare. Antinomianism has ever been regarded as a heresy. It was a sad mistake that supralapsarianism was not placed with Antinomianism in the catalogue of heresies. The repute of a few distinguished divines, who maintained it, ought not to have restrained the Church from branding their error with the stigma it deserves.

God's love is a love that is eternal in its origin. It is also everlasting in its outgoings toward God's creatures. It is a love prior to time and above and beyond all time, but it is also a love that enters into time and pervades all time. If we have a real apprehension of the Fatherhood of God, we cannot doubt that the divine love is a living and unfolding love, and that it assumes the form of parental love that never forsakes the child from his birth onward through all the ages of his growth, even to the end. From this point of view, if life in this world is brief and life in the Middle State is long, we must rise to the conception of the love of God as accomplishing even greater works of redemption in the Middle State

than in this world. The Roman Catholic Church has ever had this conception. Its doctrine of purgatory has a powerful influence upon the religious life in this world and upon the entire system of Roman Theology. Protestantism, when it threw overboard the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, also threw away with it much of the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Middle State. It magnified the love of God in the grace of election and forgiveness of sins in this life, but did not trace the workings of the divine grace in the Middle State.

2. The Protestant reformers, however, laid hold of the doctrine of *the Living God,* and found vital union with Him in redemption, and, in this respect, overcame the abstract ideas of God that prevailed in the Roman Church. This doctrine of the Living God was abandoned by Protestant scholastics. Dr. Isaac Dorner again brought it into prominence, and it is becoming fruitful in a living theology. This doctrine is important for the unfolding of the Middle State. Those who are in vital relations with the Living God can never die. They live on beyond the gate of death; they live the life of God, in communion with God. Such a life, hid in this world with Christ, there manifests itself in its richness and fulness. It unfolds from one degree of glory into another. What wonders of redemption are wrapped up in life with God! What infinite possibilities are within the reach of that being whose life is begotten of God, and whose life has no other end or aim than the transcendent experience of divine sonship and the supreme blessedness of Godlikeness!

3. Protestantism was at fault in taking *too narrow a view of redemption.* It was necessary to magnify justification by faith and carefully separate it from sanctification and glorification, but it was a mistake to lay such stress on justification and faith that sanctification and love were thrown into the background, and this to such an extent that some divines had the presumption to teach that good works were hurtful to salvation. This narrowing of the original base of the Reformation was the chief reason why Staupitz and other evangelical men preferred to remain in the Church of Rome. The Church

of Rome still maintains a more comprehensive view of redemption than is common in Protestant Churches. Her fault is that she does not distinguish and properly define justification and sanctification. Protestantism defined justification, but left sanctification in a very uncertain condition. The Puritan Reformation unfolded the doctrine of sanctification and defined it as a progressive work of God, but did not define its appropriating instrument. It laid stress on the importance of sanctification in this life. It saw that sanctification must be completed in the Middle State but it left this subject in such an obscure form that it has been the general opinion in Calvinistic Churches that sanctification was completed at the very moment of death.

4. This interpretation was favoured by the scholastic divines, who taught the doctrine of a *judgment at death* which assigns men to heaven or hell. This doctrine of a judgment at death has no warrant in the Scriptures or in the Creeds of Christendom. It is not only unsupported by Scripture and the Symbols, but it violates them all; for it throws the day of judgment into the background, robs it of its place and importance in the Christian system and in religious experience, and applies many passages of Scripture that belong only to it, to the judgment at death, and so makes death the supreme issue.

Furthermore, the doctrine of a judgment at death is a heathen doctrine derived from the heathen mythological conception of a god of the realm of the dead. It was taken up by the scholastic divines of the Middle Ages, and borrowed from them by the Protestant scholastics. It does violence to the doctrine of Scripture and the Augustinian doctrine of Sin and Grace, that the human race had its probation in Adam, and when he fell was judged in him and condemned to death and the abode of the lost. The heathen doctrine of a judgment at death throws both the original judgment and the final judgment into the background, and puts a crisis in a false place in the history of redemption.[1]

[1] See Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 195 *f.*

5. Furthermore, the attitude of Theology in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been changed toward the great crisis of the *Second Advent.* The doctrine of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church in all its Creeds, Symbols and Liturgies is that the Advent is imminent. This is expressed in that wonderful hymn, "Dies Iræ." But in the eighteenth century two errors, that were revived by the Anabaptists and a few isolated scholars, gained a rapid supremacy in the Theology of the Protestant Churches. The one of these is the Premillenarian doctrine. This separated the advent of the Messiah by a thousand years from the last judgment. It retained the church doctrine of the imminency of the Advent, but pushed the divine judgment into the background. The other error was still more serious, for it postponed the Second Advent as well as the judgment until after the Millennium had been completed, and thus antagonised the doctrine of the Church as to the great crisis. This latter opinion has so prevailed in the nineteenth century that it has been regarded as orthodox, owing to its advocacy by leading divines in British and American Churches.

Both of these serious errors should be banished, with the doctrine of a particular judgment at death, as all alike contrary to the Scriptures and the Creeds, and as obstructions to the development of a Biblical and Historical Theology. The Millennium of the Scriptures and of the Fathers is not an object for our future expectation. The Church has already enjoyed that experience and is enjoying it now. The Millennium of popular conception is a conceit without support in the Scriptures or in the Creeds. The crisis that we are to look forward to, long for, watch for and pray for is the Advent of our Lord in glory and judgment at the end of the Age, to glorify his saints and perfect his kingdom. In modern Eschatology the Millennium has usurped the place of the Middle State.

6. *The divine grace* is imparted by the *sacraments* of the Church. The Roman Catholics teach that all who have not enjoyed these sacraments are excluded from heaven, and also from purgatory. Many theologians recognise, however, a

baptism of desire for those who would be baptised if they could be. It is difficult for strict Lutherans to extend redemption beyond the bounds of the Christian Church and the use of the means of grace. The Reformed Churches teach that the divine grace is not limited to the ordinary means, and hence the Divine Spirit may work apart from the Church and its ordinances, and so it is possible to conceive that the Kingdom of God is more extensive than the visible Church. But the question still remains, How may the divine grace be appropriated by the person to be redeemed?

The Protestant Reformation made an important advance in the History of Doctrine by its definition of *Justification by Faith only*. This is the banner doctrine of Protestantism, the doctrine by which the Church stands or falls. The Roman Catholics confound justification and sanctification. They make both justification and sanctification the product of the sacraments of the Church in this life. It is appropriated by the use of the sacraments. It is carried on in the Middle State by purgatorial fires. The Protestants separated justification from sanctification, and represented that justification was appropriated by *faith alone*, and not through the bare use of the sacraments. They taught that sanctification was the fruit of justification, but they did not carefully define it. It is the merit of the Puritan Reformation that it defined sanctification, repentance and the doctrines related to them. These doctrines were considered in their relation to this life and the ultimate state, but were not applied to the Middle State. Calvinism remained indifferent to the question of the Middle State, because it was content to leave all to the electing grace of God.

Redemption After Death

7. But Arminianism and Semi-Arminianism could not be indifferent. Daniel Whitby first formulated the doctrine of *Probation* in this life, in his attack upon the Five Points of Calvinism; and Bishop Butler gave it currency among all the opponents of English Deism, so that it has been largely appro-

priated by Calvinists, and has in many respects warped Calvinistic Theology.[1]

The doctrine that this life is a probation calls attention to the fact, that it is so in reality only to a very small portion of our race. And if the redemption of a part depends on their use of their probation, how can those be saved who have no probation at all? It seems necessary, therefore, to extend probation for these into the Middle State, or to give the vast majority of mankind over to the devil. Accordingly, Whitby taught the annihilation of the wicked,[2] and Butler consistently held to the extension of probation into the future life.[3] Other probationists must either follow their example or else abandon the doctrine of probation altogether. Arminians and Semi-Arminians must in the end take one of these two alternative courses. Arminians and Semi-Arminians, who believe in the doctrine of probation, must face this question. If probation is to be extended to the Middle State, they must in some way conceive of the Gospel extending into Hades, for it is difficult to see any possibility for regeneration there without it. Several theories have been proposed to overcome this difficulty.

(1) Some think that when our Saviour preached to the imprisoned spirits he organised those whom he saved into a Church, and left them in Abaddon with a commission to preach his Gospel to the lost. It might be said that such a mission would be so difficult and exacting that it is hard to believe that the Saviour would lay it upon any of his redeemed. And yet I cannot help the thought that there have been and are to-day, Christians who would be willing to go into the depths of Abaddon to glorify Christ and save souls. How much more those, who may have been redeemed by Christ in Abaddon itself, might regard it as a privilege to labour for him in this prison of the lost!

(2) It has been conjectured that hypocrites and others,

[1] Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 217 *seq.*
[2] Commentaries, II. Thess., p. 391, ed. 1710.
[3] Analogy, I, 13, II, 6.

who know the Gospel, but have no saving experience of it here, may recall it there and be saved by it, and in this way become the preachers of Hades. In that ingenious book, *Letters from Hell*, the author suggests that hypocritical priests and people assemble in Church on the sabbaths in Hell, as was their habit in this world, and that they are tormented by not being able to recall the Gospel to their minds. It seems to me that it is far more likely that the larger portion of them would remember it. Such a paralysis of the memory is unpsychological. The lost are not to be imbeciles or madmen. And it is not incredible that a considerable portion of the Bible might be recovered from the memories of those who go thither. This is certainly true if the current opinions in the Christian Churches are true, that all Heretics and Jews are sent there. A Hades full of Protestants, as the Romanists think, could hardly be without the Gospel. A place of torment where Roman Catholics are found by the hundreds of millions—popes, archbishops, monks, nuns and all—could hardly be in such terrible ignorance of Christ and his Word. The Old Testament, with its Messianic promise, could hardly pass from the minds of all Jews. Even Unitarians, Universalists and German Rationalists might reasonably recall some of those passages of the New Testament that contain in them the sum of the Gospel and are called by Luther little Bibles. In this case we would have to ask whether the Gospel could lose its power there; whether it would be deprived of the influence of the Divine Spirit, and finally, whether all those who have gone there have become so hardened as to be incapable of faith and repentance?

(3) It has been generally thought by the advocates of an extension of redemption to the abode of the lost, that the Saviour might commission some of the redeemed of this world to preach his Gospel there. It is true, this would be a difficult and hazardous work for any man to undertake. It is true that there was an impassable gulf that Abraham and Lazarus were not allowed to cross.[1] But this did not prevent

[1] Luke xvi. 26 *f.*

our Saviour from crossing that gulf during his ministry to the underworld,[1] and it does not exclude the possibility that he might bridge that chasm for the heralds of redemption in his wondrous love for lost souls. It is conceivable that he may have done this. The difficulty lies not in the inability of the Messiah to send, or in the readiness of preachers to go, but in the feasibility of the work itself.

Many in the early Church thought this work feasible. The Shepherd of Hermas represents the apostles and martyrs as carrying on the preaching of Christ in Hades. And, indeed, what man is there, who has a spark of heroism, who would not rather work for Christ among the lost in Hades, if there were any possibility of such a work, than to pass centuries in a dreamy state of existence in Paradise, or live a life of ease and selfish gratification in the heights of heaven? Far better to work in Sheol than idle in heaven. The current views of the state of blessedness are unethical and demoralising. They have little attraction for men of intellect and power, or for souls on fire with love to Christ and eager for the redemption of men. If we cannot serve our Saviour in heaven better than on earth, there is little to attract us after death. But, thanks be unto God, we know that we may glorify him in the better world. We may share the aim of Paul, that whether in heaven or on earth we may be well-pleasing to him.[2] There are inexhaustible treasures of redemption that we may appropriate for ourselves, and that we may share in distributing to others.

All such theories of redemption of lost souls after death are castles in the air. They have no solid ground on which to rest. They are not so dangerous as some would have it; they cannot disturb the real faith of the Church. They may unsettle those who see the crisis for mankind in the event of death. And they will render real service if they should destroy this error altogether. They may expose the weakness of the current Eschatology. They may thus be a blessing in disguise. For the real faith of the Church, as expressed

[1] I Peter iii. 19; iv. 6. [2] 2 Cor. v. 9.

in the Creeds of Christendom, looks forward, now as in the ages of the past, not to the day of death or a millennium, but to the Second Advent of the Messiah and his day of judgment, when he will make the final decision, that will issue in everlasting ruin to some wretched creatures, but in everlasting bliss to the human race as a whole.

Salvation of Infants and Heathen

8. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Lutheran, Anglican and Reformed National Churches, the entire population belonged to the Church by baptism, and the great majority by partaking of the Lord's Supper. The National Churches took entire possession of their respective countries, and either banished, reduced to submission, imprisoned or put to death dissenters. The conception of *the everlasting death of children* did not spring into the mind of theologians or the people, except so far as they were involved in the everlasting damnation of the heathen. This was taken as a matter of course. But in those days there was little contact with the heathen, and the mind of men was not impressed with this awful fact. There were a few theologians, such as Zwingli and Cœlius Secundus Curio, who held that the grace of God extended to the heathen. But at that time theology did not confront the problem.

The development of Puritanism in the seventeenth century and the origination of a large number of sects in Holland and Great Britain, such as Anabaptists, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, Universalists, Arminians; and the new circumstances that arose, disclosing thousands and millions of unbaptised children in Christian lands; forced the question of the salvation of unbaptised children upon the attention of theologians. Furthermore, the result of the religious conflicts in Great Britain and Holland produced a large class of men and women who declined communion with the Churches in the way of Sacrament. The strict rules of the dissenting Churches, excluding all but those who would comply with

their rules, and changing the churches into a multitude of religious clubs, increased the number of the population who did not belong to the Church and were not professing Christians. This forced the ministry to consider whether these men and women, many of them leading upright lives, were to be damned in Hell forever. In the eighteenth century these matters came before the mind and heart of Christians as never before. The result of these things has been a gradual change of opinion on these subjects, and the recognition of the universal salvation of infants, and the admission that men may be saved who are not in communion with the Church.

The present century brought the Church of Christ face to face with the heathen world. Hundreds of millions of heathen stand over against nominal Christians half their number. The latter must be reduced by multitudes who are inhabitants of Christian lands, but who do not profess the Faith of Christ. It is safe to say that there are not one hundred millions on the earth to-day who comply with the methods of salvation taught in Christian Churches. The damnation of these millions of heathen, who have never heard of Christ, and millions of nominal Christians, who do not use the means of grace offered them by the Church, is an awful fact for the Church to confront after nearly two thousand years of Christianity on the earth. The ministry and the people do not really believe that these multitudes will be damned. The matter is eased a little by the theory that the dying infants of the heathen are saved, and some of the best of heathen adults may attain redemption; but the great mass of the adult population of Asia and Africa—yes, of Europe and America also—are doomed to hell-fire according to the popular theology. The ministers sometimes preach it, and the people listen to this doctrine as they do to many others, but they are not moved by it. They accept it as orthodox doctrine without understanding it; but they do not really believe it in their hearts. If they did they would be more worthy of damnation than the heathen themselves. If a single man were in

peril of physical death, the whole community would be aroused to save him. No price would be too great. Men and women would cheerfully risk their lives to save him. Those who would not do this would be regarded as base cowards. But here, according to the average missionary sermon, are untold millions of heathen perishing without the Gospel, and at death going into everlasting fire. Vast multitudes of unevangelised persons in our cities and towns and villages are confronting the same cruel destiny. If the ministry and people really believed it they would pour out their wealth like water; they would rush in masses to the heathen world with the Gospel of redemption. There would be a new crusade that would put the old crusades to shame. Those who have the Gospel, and will not give it to others who know it not, may incur a worse doom in the day of judgment than the ignorant. Those who knew the Lord's will and did it not will be beaten with many stripes; those who knew not and did things worthy of stripes with few stripes.[1]

The difficulty is to construct a doctrine of the salvation of infants and the heathen, in harmony with established doctrines. The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith implies that there can be no salvation without justification on the part of God, and faith on the part of man. No orthodox Protestant thought of justification without the exercise of personal faith on the part of the justified. There must be an application of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit to every one to be saved, and there must be a personal appropriation of Jesus Christ on the part of all who are redeemed. The order of Salvation is necessary in all its parts for every child of God. Thus the Westminster Confession says:

> Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth (xi. 1). . . . All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption (xii. 1). . . . They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are farther sanctified really and personally (xiii. 1). . . . They whom God hath accepted in his

[1] Lk. xii. 48.

Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved (xvii. 1).

There is but one way of salvation for all, one *ordo salutis*. There is but one kind of justification, one kind of sanctification, one kind of saving faith, and one kind of repentance unto life. The modern extension of the doctrine of redemption so as to include not only infants of believers, but all infants; and also so as to embrace not only the people of God under the Old Covenant and the people of God who accept the New Covenant, but also multitudes from among the heathen, who have not the light of either of these covenants, but only the light of nature; raises the question how these can be saved consistently with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith and the Puritan doctrine of sanctification.

It is evident that the orthodox divines of the seventeenth century constructed their systems of doctrine without any conception of such an extension of redemption. The theory of some modern theologians, such as the elder and younger Hodge, that infants may be saved without personal faith, subverts the fundamental principle of Protestantism. The current unformulated theory that heathen may be saved without acceptance of the righteousness of Christ undermines the fundamental principle of Christianity. Christians are not saved in classes or masses, but as individuals out of the mass of corruption. It is anti-Christian to say that the entire race of men may be regarded as redeemed, unless it is expressly said that they are lost. On the contrary, the Bible and the Creeds teach that all are lost unless they are personally redeemed and experience the work of grace. There must be some way in which infants, incapables, and pious men beyond the bounds of Christendom, may be brought into contact with God and His Christ, and have an opportunity to believe in him; or they cannot be saved in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures and the Symbols of Christendom. Unless this can be done, Protestantism—yes, the entire system of Christian doctrine, breaks down.

The fault of modern Protestantism has been in neglecting the doctrine of salvation as a whole, with its *ordo salutis*, and in thinking too exclusively of the initial steps. Justification by faith was too exclusively in the minds of the early Protestants, and regeneration is unduly prominent in American Protestant Theology since the rise of Methodism, having taken the place of the older doctrine of Effectual Calling. It is not difficult to understand that the Divine Spirit may regenerate all the elect in this world, and plant within them the seeds of faith and repentance, so that redemption may have its beginning here for infants and incapables. We may also see this faith and repentance germinate and spring up under the light of nature, and feel after God and His Christ in many among the heathen; but the redemption thus begun must in some way bring them to Christ in order that they may have the possession and enjoyment of salvation.

From the Arminian doctrine of probation and of human responsibility for the initiation of redemption, the first steps of regeneration must take place in the Intermediate State for all these persons, or not at all. But from the Calvinistic position, which makes the divine grace prevenient, it is easy to hold that every elect person is actually regenerated in this life before he leaves the world. It seems that the birth of little children into this world would have little significance if they were not to have their regeneration here also. They must be born as children of Adam to take part in the ruin of the race, and it would seem that only the children of Adam have a share in the Saviour of the race. From this point of view, Calvinism ought to have no hesitation in advancing into the doctrine of the Middle State. The salvation which is begun here by regeneration is carried on there. For the vast majority of our race who die in infancy, or have lived beyond the range of the means of grace, their salvation, begun in this life by regeneration, is carried on in the Intermediate State with the exercise of personal faith in Christ, whom they know there for the first. There the germs of faith and repentance, that have been put in their hearts in regeneration by the Holy

Spirit, spring up in the sunlight of Christ's own face, and lay hold of him as their Saviour. Not till then are they justified, for there can be no justification without faith for them, any more than for others. The Intermediate State is for them a state of blessed possibilities of redemption. This is beautifully expressed in a hymn of Ephraim, the Syrian, translated by Professor Gilbert:

> "Our God, to Thee sweet praises rise
> From youthful lips in Paradise;
> From boys fair robed in spotless white,
> And nourished in the courts of light.
> In arbors they, where soft and low
> The blessed streams of light do flow:
> And Gabriel, a shepherd strong,
> Doth gently guide their flocks along.
> Their honors higher and more fair
> Than those of saints and virgins are;
> God's sons are they on that far coast,
> And nurselings of the Holy Ghost."

The Intermediate State is, therefore, for a considerable portion of our race a state for the consummation of *their justification.* The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone forces to this position.

Progressive Sanctification after Death

9. But justification by faith belongs to the earlier stages of redemption. All those who are justified are also sanctified. No one can be ultimately and altogether redeemed without sanctification. It is necessary that believers should have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and that they should be "more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord"; and "so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." The doctrine of immediate sanctification is a heresy, which has always been rejected by orthodox Protestants. The Westminster Confession definitely states: "This sanctification is throughout,

yet imperfect in this life." If imperfect in this life for all believers, there is no other state in which it can be perfected save in the Intermediate State. The Intermediate State is, therefore, for all believers without exception a state for *their sanctification.* They are there trained in the school of Christ, and are prepared for the Christian perfection which they must attain ere the judgment day.

I am well aware that it has been a common opinion that believers are at their death—that is, in the very moment of death, completely sanctified. This opinion seems to be favoured by the statement of the Westminster Shorter Catechism—"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness."[1] This is one of a number of instances in which the Shorter Catechism by its brief, unguarded statements has occasioned error. The Larger Catechism is fuller and clearer when it says: "The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible Church enjoy immediately after death, is in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory."[2] The phrase, "immediately after death," is the phrase of the question: "What is the communion in glory with Christ which the members of the invisible Church enjoy *immediately after death?*" and it is designed to cover the *entire period* of the Intermediate State as distinguished from the state of resurrection, and it is not limited to the moment after death, in which the Intermediate State has its beginning. This is clear from Question 82, where the general question, "What is the communion in glory which the members of the invisible Church have with Christ?" is answered in the following three divisions of condition, which appear in three questions that follow: "The communion in glory, which the members of the invisible Church have with Christ, is in this life, immediately after death, and at last perfected at the resurrection and day of judgment." It ought to be clear to any one that, having made sanctification a work of God's grace and a

[1] Quest. 37. [2] Quest. 86.

growth extending through the entire life of the believer and left incomplete at death; and that, having denied the doctrine of immediate sanctification; the Westminster divines could not be so inconsistent as to teach that at the moment of death, occurring at various stages in the growth of holiness, sanctification then changed its nature, ceased to be a progressive work, a growth, and became immediate, an act of God, like justification. This would be to undermine the Protestant doctrine of sanctification. It is essential to the integrity of the Roman Catholic and Protestant systems of Faith alike, that they should resist the Antinomian doctrines of eternal justification without faith, and of immediate sanctification at any time or in any state or place.

There are some theologians who persuade themselves that they can believe in the immediate justification and the immediate sanctification of infants, of incapables and of heathen adults in the change of death, in that supreme moment of transition from this life to the Middle State. Such a theory may be stated in words, but it is inconceivable in fact. What a transformation would take place in the intellectual and moral powers of infants, incapables and the dark-minded heathen! Such a metamorphosis is not taught in the Scriptures or the Creeds. It would violate the intellectual and moral constitution of man. Those who believe it may claim that all things are possible to God. But it is difficult to understand how it could be possible even for God to make the immediate transformation of a little babe into a perfectly holy man in the image of Jesus Christ; or of the instantaneous accomplishment of the entire *ordo salutis* for an idiot in the very moment of death. Such a magical doctrine is subversive of the entire structure of Christianity. It belongs to an age of magic, and has no place in an age of Reason and Faith, and is altogether unmoral.

It was a keen thrust of Möhler, that Protestantism without a purgatory must either let men enter heaven stained with sin, or else think of an immediate magical transformation at death, by which sin mechanically and violently falls off

from us with the body. Hase justly replied that Protestantism would not accept this dilemma, and that Protestant Theology taught that the divine grace was operative and men capable of moral development after death. This view is the established opinion in German Theology. Dorner, Martensen, Kahnis and many other later divines teach that there must be a growth in sanctification in the Middle State. All Protestants must accept this doctrine, or they are sure to be caught in the inconsistency of magical, mechanical and unethical opinions. This opinion is commonly held by Protestants in Great Britain. Why should Protestants in America lag behind their brethren in Europe? They have been caught in the snares of recent errors. Let them break through the snares and re-establish themselves in the ancient Christian doctrine of the Middle State.

10. The deeper ethical sense in German Theology since Kant, forced divines to distinguish grades of sin and guilt and punishment, and to study as never before the psychological origin of sin and its development in human nature. Attention was thus called to the words of Jesus that *the sin against the Holy Spirit* was the only eternal sin, the only unpardonable transgression.[1] This sin is not only unpardonable in this age, but also in the age to come. This raises the question whether any man is irretrievably lost ere he commits this unpardonable sin; and whether those who do not commit it in this world ere they die are, by the mere crisis of death, brought into an unpardonable state; and whether, when Jesus said that this sin against the Holy Spirit was unpardonable here and also hereafter, he did not imply that all other sins might be pardoned hereafter as well as here. This conclusion was reached by Nitzsch, Tholuck, Julius Müller, Martensen, Dorner, Schaff and many others.

The doctrine of immediate justification and sanctification at death involves the conceit that the child who dies in infancy a few moments after birth is immediately justified and sancti-

[1] Mt. xii. 22–32; Mk. iii. 22–30; Lk. (xii: 10); see, *Messiah of the Gospels*, pp. 179–181.

fied, receives saving faith and all the Christian graces in an instant; while his brother, who lives in this world, is not justified until he reaches the age in which he can exercise personal faith; and then he has all the struggles of life to undergo, until he reaches the limits of human life without the comforts of sanctification, which he cannot receive until death. If this were so, then Blessed are those who die in infancy, and thus outstrip their fellows in the Christian race. Vastly better to be born to die than to be born to live in this uncertain world. What parent would not prefer to lay all his children in an early grave, assured of their salvation, rather than expose them to the dreadful risks of life and the possibility of eternal damnation? According to the current beliefs, those Chinese mothers who put their children to death make more Christians than all the missionaries.

Overcome with such reflections, we might express our misery in the complaint of Job.

> Why died I not from the womb?
> Why did I not give up the ghost when I came from the belly?
> Why did the knees receive me?
> Or why the breasts, that I should suck?
> For now would I have lain down and been quiet,
> I would have slept; then had I been at rest.
>
> (Job iii. 11–13.)

The Christian doctrine of sanctification forces us to the conclusion that the Middle State is now and has ever been the school of Christian Sanctification. The common Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory is a perversion of the true doctrine. It is mechanical and unethical, like other peculiar doctrines of Roman Catholic dogmaticians and popular superstitions. But it is better than a blank agnosticism. There is much truth and some comfort in the midst of its errors, and it has profound consolation to offer to the bereaved and penitent. Here is one of its greatest strongholds. It is less mechanical and less unethical than the theory that has prevailed among Protestants that there is both immediate justification and immediate sanctification in the article of death.

The doctrines associated with Christian sanctification lead to similar results. Are the experiences of saving faith, assurance of grace and salvation, religious worship, the communion of saints, confined to a few adult Christians in this life? Have they no meaning for the vast majority of the redeemed? Rather for the best of Christians the sublime truth and comfort involved in these doctrines are not realised until they enter upon the Middle State.

Those who hold the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death do not really understand the Protestant doctrine of sanctification and the principles of Christian Ethics. Regeneration is an act of God, and from its very idea is instantaneous, for it is the production of a new life in man. Regeneration is only one of the terms used in the New Testament to describe this beginning of Christian life. Resurrection is more frequently used. Creation is also employed. Effectual Calling was preferred by the Westminster divines. All these terms indicate a divine originating act. Regeneration is always such, and cannot be otherwise. But sanctification is the growth of that life from birth to full manhood, to the likeness of Christ. It is always in this world a growth; it is incomplete with the best of men at death. Does it change its nature then? Shall the little babe, the idiot, the seeker after God among the heathen, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, and the saints of all ages, all alike in an instant leap over this period of growth, however different the stage of progress may be? Shall a babe become a man in an instant? Shall a savage become a philosopher in a moment? Shall a little boy become an Augustine, and a John Calvin be conformed to the image of Christ, all at a divine creative word? Then the difference between regeneration and sanctification has disappeared for the vast majority of the redeemed.

If regeneration and sanctification are one act, how can we distinguish the intervening act of justification; and if regeneration, justification and sanctification may all be one at death, why not in this life, as the Plymouth brethren teach? Why was the world turned upside down at the Protestant

Reformation in order to discriminate justification by faith from sanctification if, after all these centuries of Protestantism, they are really identical for the vast majority of our race, and are only to be distinguished in those who live to maturity and become true Christians? Then Protestantism would be not only a failure, but also one of the greatest crimes in history. This is the pit of ruin into which the dogmatic divines of our day would force us rather than extend the light of redemption into the Middle State.

Those divines who confound sanctification with justification do not understand the principles of sanctification and Christian Ethics. Sanctification has two sides—mortification and vivification; the former is manward, the latter is Godward. Believers who enter the Middle State enter sinless; they are pardoned and justified; they are mantled in the blood and righteousness of Christ; and nothing will be able to separate them from his love. They are also delivered from all temptations such as spring from without, from the world and the devil. They are encircled with influences for good such as they have never enjoyed before. But they are still the same persons, with all the gifts and graces and also all the evil habits of mind, disposition and temper they had when they left the world. It is unpsychological to suppose that these will all be changed in the moment of death. It is the Manichean heresy to hold that sin belongs to the physical organisation and is laid aside with the body. If this were so, how can any of our race carry their evil natures with them into the Middle State and incur the punishment of their sins?

The Plymouth Brethren hold that there are two natures in the redeemed, the old man and the new. In accordance with such a theory, the old man might be cast off at death. But this is only a more subtile kind of Manicheism, which has ever been regarded as heretical. Sin, as our Saviour teaches, has its source in the heart, in the higher and immortal part of man.[1] It is the work of sanctification to overcome sin in the higher nature. We may justly hold that the evil that lingers in the

[1] Mt. xii. 35; xv. 18–20

higher moral nature of believers will be suppressed and modified with an energy of repentance, humiliation, confession and determination that will be more powerful than ever before, because it will be stimulated by the presence of Christ and his saints. The Christian graces will unfold under more favourable circumstances than in this world. If it were possible that sanctification at death would make men so perfect in holiness as to remove all evil tendencies and habits; and not only destroy their disposition to sin, but so lift them above temptation that they would be like our Saviour during his earthly life, *posse non peccare;* and also like our Saviour after he had sanctified himself and risen victor over sin, death and Satan, and attained the position of *non posse peccare;* even then they would only have accomplished the negative side of sanctification, the mortification or entire putting to death the old man of sin. They would still have to undergo the process of vivification and learn the *practice* of true holiness.

What practice have infants and imbeciles when they enter the Middle State? How far short in practice do the best of men fall? Are they no longer to have an opportunity for the practice of true holiness? Will there be no chance to learn what true holiness is? The Middle State must, from the very nature of the case, be a school of sanctification.

11. It was a profound saying of Henry B. Smith that Eschatology ought to be *Christologised.* It is greatly to be regretted that he did not turn his own attention to that theme and give us the fruit of his investigations. Dr. Schaff gave his attention to this subject many years ago in his book on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and has added not a few valuable hints in his later publications.

Christ is the mediator between God and man in the exercise of his offices as prophet, priest and king. Those who passed a few years in this world, and then went into the Middle State and have been there for centuries, have not passed beyond the need of his mediation. The interval between death and the judgment has its lessons and its training for

them as well as for us. The prophetic office of Christ continues to those who are in the Middle State. After his own death he went to the abode of the departed spirits, and preached unto them his Gospel. He ascended into heaven, taking his redeemed with him. All those whom he has purchased with his blood ascend to him to abide with him. The redeemed robber is not the only one to whom he has something to say in the Middle State.[1] All believers enter his school and are trained in the mysteries of his kingdom. Those mysteries are not cleared up by a flash of revelation; they are revealed as the redeemed are able to apprehend them and use them. It is improbable that Augustine, Calvin and Luther will be found in the same class-room as the redeemed negro slave or the babe that has entered heaven to-day. The Fathers and doctors of the Church will be the teachers of the dead, as they taught the living.

Christ's priestly office continues for them. They who enter the Middle State still need his blood and righteousness. Even if they commit no positive sin they do not reach positive perfection until their sanctification has been completed in the attainment of the complete likeness of Christ. They need the robe of Christ's righteousness until they have gained one of their own. He is still their surety, who has engaged with them and with God to present them perfect in the last great day.

But, above all, Christ is a king in the Intermediate State. Here in this world his reign is only partial; there it is complete. Here his kingdom is interwoven with the kingdom of darkness. There it is apart from all evil and hindrance. His reign is entire over his saints, and they are being prepared by him for the advent in which they will come with him to reign over the world.

The Church is chiefly in the Intermediate State. The Church on earth is only the vestibule of it. In this world we have learned to know in part the Messiah of the Cross; there in the Middle State the redeemed know the glory of the Mes-

[1] Lk. xxiii. 42–43.

siah of the Throne. There the Church is in its purity and complete organisation, as the bride of the Lamb. There Christ the head, and his body the Church are in blessed unity. We have glimpses in the Apocalypse of the vast assemblies of the saints in heaven about the throne of the Lamb.[1] And the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us a picture of their organised assembly on the heights of the heavenly Zion.[2] It is important for the Church on earth to have a better apprehension of its relations to the Church in the Middle State. The Protestant branch of Christendom is weaker here than the Roman Catholic. It is high time to overcome this defect, for it is not merely agnosticism, it is sin against the mysteries of our religion. The modern Church ought to return to the faith of the ancient Church, and believe in the "Communion of Saints."

12. We have developed the doctrine of the Middle State in the light of other established Christian doctrines. If the Church has rightly defined these, then it results from them that we must take that view of the Middle State that they suggest. If we are not prepared to do this we cast doubt upon the legitimacy and competency of these doctrines. We confess them inadequate and insufficient. The Augustinian principle that salvation is by the divine grace, and that this grace is ever prevenient, enables us to believe that the *ordo salutis* begins for all who are saved, by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit in this life. This regeneration begets the seeds of a perfect Christian life. For some the *ordo salutis* makes no further advance in this life; for others it advances in different degrees and stages; but for all the redeemed, the Middle State is of vast importance, as the state in which our redemption is taken up where it is left incomplete in this life, and then carried on to its perfection. This view of the Middle State gives it its true theological importance. It enables us to look forward with hope and joy for an entrance upon it. This life is an introduction to it. It mediates between death and the resurrection, and prepares for the ultimate blessedness.

[1] Rev. v. 11-14; vii. 9–17. [2] Heb. xii. 22–24.

The Lost

We have thus far considered only the redeemed. Those who do not belong to that company also enter into the Middle State. But their place is a different one. It is represented as a prison, a place of destruction and torment before the resurrection of Christ, in which they are reserved for the day of judgment. There is a silence on the fate of the wicked in the Middle State since the resurrection of Jesus that is profound and unbroken in the New Testament. There are some who hold that there is a possibility of release from the prison house to join the company of the blessed. Such a hope would, indeed, be a comfort if it could be indulged for all mankind. But there seems to be no solid basis on which to rest it. The grace of God is so grand and glorious in its wonders of redemption that we may rest upon that as the solid rock of comfort. We gain more hope here than we can get from any other source whatsoever. We may be certain that when the final verdict has been rendered, we shall not be surprised that so many were not saved. But we shall rejoice at the wonderful extent and richness of the redemptive love of God in the unexpected multitudes of the blessed. And these will be not chiefly babes and imbeciles, but men and women who have undergone hardships in this life, and have overcome in its trials and temptations.

If we could find evidence in the Scriptures that there was any possibility of the extension of the benefits of regeneration and the efficacy of the means of grace into the abode of the lost, we should be glad to follow it. Or if we could see any evidence from other Christian doctrines that would lead to such a hope, we would gladly embrace it. The Scriptures are not so decidedly against it as many suppose. The one passage with reference to Dives[1] is not decisive for the present dispensation, and therefore does not shut the door of hope. The preaching of Jesus to the spirits in prison[2] is not decisive

[1] Lk. xvi. 19–31. [2] I Peter iii. 18–20; iv. 6.

for the present dispensation, and therefore does not open the door for a larger hope. Jesus by his resurrection made a change in the abode of the dead by taking some of them at least with him from Hades to Heaven. We do not know what changes have been made in Hades in other respects.[1]

The term "*eternal punishment*"[2] is not so decisive as many suppose. The words in Hebrew and Greek translated "eternal" have not that meaning of absolute limitless duration, that dogmaticians put into them. They mean very much what the English word *ever* means; and they are most commonly used for long but indefinite time, which yet may have and often does have a limit.[3] From the point of view of the divine sovereignty, it is difficult to see how it is possible to make the existence in time of any creature independent of the divine will. All that eternal punishment can mean is, that it will endure a long indefinite time, so long as it may please God, and no longer.

Jesus teaches that future punishment will be proportionate to guilt.

> And that servant, who knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. (*Lk.* xii. 47–48.)

As I have elsewhere said:

> The parable has in view the Messianic judgment at the end of the age. This difference of punishment, involved between many stripes and few, is not a difference of punishment in the Middle State after death: it is a difference of degree of punishment in the Day of Judgment, and in the age that follows that judgment in the Final State. How are we to conceive these few stripes as compared with the many? In Gehenna, are the stripes few in character, or of less degree of punishment, everlasting

[1] See Briggs' *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 530 *f.*

[2] Mt. xxv. 46.

[3] See in *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Robinson-Gesenius, new edition by Brown, Driver and Briggs, my article on the word עולם; also in Thayer's edition of Grimm's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, the article on *αἰών*.

in duration but less intensive in degree of suffering; or less in the number of the blows, so that the punishment of the less guilty comes to an end before the punishment of the more guilty? This opens up a field for speculation where we can only say that all everlasting duration is subject to such limitations as God in his sovereign reserved right may deem best to put upon it. (*Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 223.)

The Arminian doctrine of *Probation* forces all those who believe in it, to extend that probation into the Intermediate State. Sooner or later they will do it. But the Calvinistic system is in a very different position. The Calvinistic system solves the difficulties in another way. It does not limit the grace of God by human ability or inability. And yet there is nothing in Calvinism itself that prevents the extension of redemption into a future life. In point of fact, Universalism sprang out of an extreme form of Calvinism. The grace of God might work in Hades as well as in this world. Regeneration might take place there as well as here, with or without the use of the means of grace. But we cannot escape the consideration that no one goes to Hades who has not been previously in this world, where the work of regeneration might have been wrought without waiting for the Middle State. If multitudes of infants and imbeciles are regenerated before departing from this life, why not also all others who are to be redeemed?

Let us heed the Saviour's warning, "Judge not that ye be not judged." [1] We should cease damning our fellow-men and sending them to hell, for differences of doctrine, of polity and of mode of worship. Certainly if it rested with men, few of us would ever see heaven. If the various Churches were to be the judges, they would empty heaven save of a very few ancient saints, and fill hell with historic Christianity. If the judgment of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Churches were ratified in heaven to-day, as they claim that they will be, every Christian now in the world would be excluded from heaven when he dies, by the official decision of some one or more of the various ecclesiastic organisations that now govern

[1] Mt, vii, 1.

the Christian world. What a *reductio ad absurdum* is the present opinion of Christendom on this subject!

The doctrine of Progressive Sanctification after death is built on the Bible and the Creeds. It lies at the root of Purgatory, and it is a better Purgatory. It is a divine discipline, not a human probation. It banishes from the mind the terror of a judgment immediately after death, and the illusion of a magical transformation in the dying hour; and it presents in their stead, a heavenly university, a school of grace, an advance in sanctity and glory in the presence of the Messiah and the saintly dead, which is a blessed hope to the living, and a consolation to the suffering and the dying.

VII. THE CHRIST

Jesus Christ is the pivot of History, the centre of Theology, the light and joy of the world. No age has been so intent upon the study of the person, life and work of Jesus Christ as the present age. The life of Jesus has been the theme of the greatest writers of our day, and yet no theme is so fresh and inspiring. The person of Jesus has been studied as never before. The profoundest theological treatises of the century have used all the powers of the human mind in their efforts to understand and to explain the unique personality of our Redeemer. The traditional dogma unfolded the Christ of the cross and the atonement wrought thereon, but the Christ of the throne and the heavenly mediation have been neglected. Modern Christology is unfolding the Humiliation of Christ, the Kenosis of the second person of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Second Advent of our Lord. All these phases of Christology are in course of evolution. They cast a flood of light upon the whole field of theology, and are gradually transforming every other doctrine. As Henry B. Smith well said: "What Reformed theology has got to do is to 'Christologise predestination and decrees; regeneration and sanctification; the doctrine of the Church; and the whole of eschatology."

There are new difficulties and contests about all these questions. German Theology is agitated over the mode of the Incarnation—whether it was instantaneous or gradual; over the Kenosis, and the construction of the complex nature of the Redeemer. Anglican theology is agitated with regard to the Virgin Birth of our Lord and the nature of the resurrection body. Many of the Evangelicals are especially interested in the doctrine of the Second Advent. Each party is doing its work in the unfolding of some special section of Christianity which it will, in the end, contribute for the benefit of the whole doctrine. American Christianity is backward still in the department of Christology; but ere long it will become for Americans also the most absorbing, as it is ever the grandest, theme for the Christian Church; and the First Things and the Last Things will be absorbed in the blaze of the glory of the Messiah.

VIII. THE GAIN

The fruits of this theological crisis can only be great, lasting and good. The First Things, the sources and foundations of Christianity, will be tested, strengthened and assured. The living God will approach men, who use all the media of divine influence, and grant them union and communion as never before. Vital union with the living God will make living Christians, a living Church, and doctrines animated with holy living and doing.

The Last Things will cease to frighten the weak Christians, and stiffen brave men into the rejection of some childish conceptions of the universe. They will be the hope and joy, the comfort and consolation, of manly, heroic Christians ready to do and dare for Christ and his Kingdom.

Jesus Christ, in his unique personality, in the wonders of his theanthropic nature, in the comprehension of his work of redemption, will present himself to the Christian consciousness of man as their loving Master and gracious Sovereign, whom to love, serve and adore will be the bliss of living and

dying. "To be well-pleasing to Christ" will be the one end and aim of the Christian world.

It is evident that the evolutions of Christian Theology, which have brought on the theological crisis, are preparing the way for a new Reformation, in which it is probable that all the Christian Churches will share; each one, under the influence of the divine Spirit, making its own important contribution to the world-wide movement, whose goal is the unity of the Church and the redemption of the world.

XII

THE INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THERE can be no doubt that there is a crisis in the Church of England at this time; but it is altogether probable that this crisis is not so serious as it appears to be from the statements of extreme men. This crisis, like all similar crises, has been forced to a head by rash partisans, who, without commission or qualification, except their own conceit and presumption, constituted themselves the champions of orthodoxy; but the crisis could not have come to a head if there had not been a situation of real difficulty in the Church of England. It is distressing to see the peace disturbed, and human passions rage about the doctrine and worship of Christ's Church; but the experience of history teaches us that such crises are necessary for the advancement of the Church. It is the only way in which the attention of the whole Church can be concentrated upon a bad situation and its energy aroused and put forth for reformation. The present crisis is an inevitable result of the Oxford movement, as that was an inevitable resultant of the evolution of the Anglo-Catholic party of the Church of England since the Reformation.

I. THE DECISION OF THE ARCHBISHOPS AS TO THE THREE CEREMONIES

The present crisis in the Church of England arose from a public controversy about three ceremonies: namely, the use of lights in processions, the use of incense in worship, and the reservation of the Holy Sacrament. Back of these, and involved in them, are many other questions of various grades

of importance. The legality of these ceremonies was, by common consent, though unofficially, submitted to the two Anglican Archbishops for their decision. The parties interested were patiently heard. All that could be said in favour of these ceremonies was said. Through the courtesy of the present primate, then Archbishop of Winchester, I was permitted to attend a part of this hearing, and I can testify to its carefulness and impartiality. The Archbishops examined the whole case deliberately. The decision as to the use of lights and incense was given July 31, 1899, and it was adverse. Naturally the Anglo-Catholic party was greatly shocked and grieved by this decision; but with few exceptions the clergy submitted to their ecclesiastical superiors. The decision of the more serious question of Reservation was made known May 1, 1900. This was followed by the issue of a joint Pastoral Letter by the bishops of both of the Provinces of England in 1901, enjoining compliance with the decision of the Archbishops. The decision of all these questions, and other like questions, depends upon the interpretation of the Act of Uniformity; and therewith the question whether the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer were designed to exclude all ceremonies which they do not prescribe; or whether there is liberty of ceremony outside the range of its prescriptions. The Archbishops take the former view, and there can be little doubt, on legal and historic grounds, that their decision is correct.

At the same time the law of the case is a very serious obstruction to the larger liberty of worship which is demanded in our times by all parties in the Church. Although the questions decided are adverse to the Anglo-Catholic party; yet the principles, on which the decision rests, would just as surely decide questions adverse to the Puritan party, if any one should venture to raise them. The law cannot, therefore, be enforced without grave perils on both sides; the bishops have not attempted to enforce it, unless compelled so to do, either by extreme men of the Protestant party undertaking the work of prosecution, or extreme men of the Anglo-

Catholic party challenging them to do their duty by high-handed disobedience.

It is theoretically true that a law should either be enforced or else repealed. But if the repeal of a bad law should be impracticable, for reasons not involved in a difference of opinion as to the law itself, but because of other and greater interests that lie back of it and that might be threatened by that repeal; then it is wise policy not to enforce it, but to let it fall into disuse by common consent. Such is the situation in England at the present time with regard to this law. To enforce it would be to plunge Christianity in England into a most serious situation; not to enforce it, but to allow all parties reasonable liberty, injures no interest and imperils no cause, but makes for breadth, comprehensiveness and that unity in variety, which is necessary for the continued existence of a National Church.

II. THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC AND PURITAN PARTIES

The present crisis is due to the evolution of the Anglo-Catholic party especially under the impulses of the Oxford movement. Undoubtedly that movement was a movement away from Protestantism; and it is now, and in its tendencies will continue to become, increasingly anti-Protestant. The extreme Protestant party accuse it of Romanising, and raise against it the cry of "No Popery." But it is, in fact, an effort to recover ancient Catholic doctrines and ceremonies which were thrown aside at the Reformation.

The Church of England differed from the other National Churches of the Reformation by its appeal to Catholic antiquity. It sought to cast away Mediæval Christianity and to restore Ancient Christianity, whereas the other Reformed Churches sought to go back of Ancient Christianity and to restore the Christianity of Holy Scripture and build on that alone.

Furthermore, in the sixteenth century, there was a large amount of Crypto-Catholicism in the Church of England,

men who rejected the supremacy of the Pope and accepted the supreme authority of the Crown, but who yet, in other respects, held to the pre-Reformation doctrines and ceremonies, so far as was practicable. These were not troubled by Crown or prelates so long as they remained quiet and inoffensive.

The whole effort of the Puritan party was to complete the first Reformation by a second Reformation, and to banish from the Church all Mediævalism, and everything that differed from the Christianity of Holy Scripture. The Puritan party succeeded for a while in their aim, when they prevailed in Great Britain during the period of the Commonwealth; but at the Restoration, the Church of England re-established itself on the basis of Ancient Christianity, at the cost of the banishment from the established Church of a considerable portion of the British nation.

The weakening of the Protestant party within the Church, gave a greater impulse to the party of Reaction, and consequently the Mediæval tendencies of the Church of England became more aggressive in the third quarter of the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century they made little headway. The greater part of the Presbyterians had returned to the Church of England, and so strengthened the Puritan party in the Church. But the Oxford movement was a more determined advance for the recovery of Mediæval Christianity. It was virtually a return to the position of the Elizabethan Catholics, who wished to reform the Church and get rid of all abuses, but to retain the Mediæval doctrines and ceremonies for the most part. This is certainly a Romeward tendency, inasmuch as the Church of Rome retains and maintains all these doctrines and ceremonies; but it does not involve explicitly any submission to the Pope, or the acceptance of all the doctrines, canons and ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church; to say nothing of the modern dogmas of the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin and the infallibility of the Pope. It is still consistent with the contention of the Church of England, that every National Church has authority to determine its own liturgy and cere-

monies, and it does not abandon the principle of a National Church. Accordingly there is a wavering in this party. They are in an unstable position somewhat intermediate between the Greek and Latin Churches.

At the same time there seems to be a logical necessity in the movement which carried Newman and Manning and many others to Rome. But Pusey, Keble and their associates held the great majority of the party firm and faithful to the national Church which they endeavoured to reform in a Mediæval direction. There can be no doubt that this party has changed the face of English Christianity during the past half century, for the party has steadily advanced in numbers and in aggressiveness, and it has exerted a wholesome revival influence far beyond the range of the Anglo-Catholic party. This is recognised even by those who are hostile to the principles and practices of that party.

III. RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT

The three burning questions in this crisis are all related to the celebration of the Holy Communion. The most important of these is the Reservation of the Holy Sacrament. The Holy Sacrament is the great central institution of Christ's Church. In the Protestant Churches it lost this central position and became subordinate to the preaching of the pulpit. The Oxford movement has had much to do in restoring the Holy Sacrament to its rightful place and importance. There can be no doubt that it has become much more important to our generation, than to any other generation since the Protestant Reformation. There has been an increasing aversion among Anglicans to the Zwinglian view which makes it a mere memorial of Christ's passion and death. There has been increasing emphasis upon the Calvinistic view of the real spiritual presence of our Lord; and the doctrine of a real substantial presence of Christ has won many adherents, who are not willing to define that presence either in terms of consubstantiation or transubstantiation.

Celebrations of the Holy Communion have become more frequent not only in the Church of England, but in the Church of Scotland. Even in the non-conforming bodies the Lord's Supper is more highly esteemed. It is quite natural, therefore, that the sick should share in the craving for the Holy Communion, and that the dying should desire it more frequently. This greatly increases the responsible labours of the clergy in their holy office. It is not always practicable to celebrate the Holy Communion with the appointed services at the bedside of the sick, in crowded tenements and in peril of infectious diseases. Therefore, the desire for Reservation is a natural desire; for it removes most of these difficulties. If the priest may take the holy consecrated bread and wine directly to the sick and the dying without the repetition of the service, he may give them the benefits of Holy Communion much more frequently; and in many cases where they could not receive it otherwise.

The desire for Reservation is undoubtedly connected with a very deep sense of the saving benefits of the Holy Communion, and with the doctrine of the real presence.

Those who hold these views are not altogether content with the rubric which the late primate urged. It says:

> But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness or for want of warning in due time to the curate or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the curate shall instruct him that if he do truly repent him of his sins and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.

They think this rubric does not altogether meet the present situation. For they feel that, however much you may magnify spiritual communion with Christ, there is in sacramental communion something unique, which cannot be had in any other way; and that it is a hardship to deprive of its unspeak-

able benefits those who most need this Sacrament, because of those impediments to a celebration at the bedside, which would all be done away with, if they could partake of the reserved sacrament. They think that any peril of adoration, involved in reservation, is more than counterbalanced by the benefit of reservation, in all these cases where the rubric recognises a celebration as impracticable.

Reservation does not involve in itself the doctrine or practice of adoration. You may reserve for purpose of adoration as in the Roman Catholic Church; or you may reserve for practical reasons, to give the sacrament to the sick and dying, without any purpose of adoration. This is distinctly recognised by the late primate in his decision. He distinguishes three kinds of Reservation. On the other hand, you may adore the Christ substantially present in the Holy Sacrament without any reservation at all. You do not, therefore, prevent adoration by refusing reservation, and you do not permit adoration by permitting reservation. These two things are in no necessary relation the one to the other. You may forbid adoration and you may permit reservation. You may forbid reservation and you may permit adoration. The two are entirely separable both in principle and in practice.

At the same time, there can be little doubt that Reservation, before the Reformation in the Church of England, and in the Church of Rome everywhere since, has been so much for the purpose of adoration, in the opportunity given because of the Sacrament abiding on the altar, that the reservation for the sick and the dying is merged and lost sight of in the more common use. But where the Sacrament is carried from the altar to the sick and the dying, it is quite easy to distinguish between the adoration which greets it in a Roman Catholic community, and the simple, quiet, reverent way in which an Anglican priest carries it without thinking of adoration.

It is said by some that the sick need the entire ceremony to prepare them for the act of communion. But, on the

other hand, it is urged that the invalid who intends to participate will, in his mind, through his familiarity with his prayer-book, follow the entire service in the church, and thus be better prepared to partake, than if he had been hurried through the shortened service in his own home; so that he really has a better preparation in this way than in the other.

For myself, I wish that liberty might be granted at this point. I think that in a wise Christian policy such liberty should be granted. But it seems evident that the law of the Church is against it, and that the law was designed to be against it, and the late primate's decision cannot be gainsaid.

Reservation, at the time of the Reformation, meant essentially reservation in the church for adoration; and any toleration of reservation at that time would have involved adoration. It was necessary to abolish reservation in order to abolish the practice of adoration of the Host. It is true that it is quite possible to argue that the priest reserves for the sick and the dying before he thinks of the remainder, but the rubric was certainly designed to exclude such reservation when it says:

> And if any of the Bread and Wine remain unconsecrated, the curate shall have it to his own use; but if any remain of that which was consecrated it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.

The American rubric varies in language but does not give any more liberty of reservation.

All attempts to evade the rubrics by unauthorised limitations of the terms, and by insertions of action where there is silence, rest upon the vicious principle of interpretation—that anything is lawful which is not distinctly forbidden; whereas the principle of Uniformity implies that nothing shall be done which is not prescribed, and nothing left undone which is prescribed.

IV. THE PRINCIPLE OF UNIFORMITY

The principle of Uniformity is too rigid, and interferes too much with the liberty of worship which is demanded in our age. In fact, it has never been possible to enforce it without arbitrariness and favoritism, capriciousness and injustice. But the true way to meet the difficulties is not to misinterpret the law, but to frankly accept it under the circumstances, and let the bishops, the lawful executives, at their discretion, grant such dispensations as the situation may require in any given case. In fact, they have always done so. All that we should ask is that they should do so fairly, comprehensively and in an unpartisan and loving manner. The late primate recognises this when he said that in exceptional cases, "*Necessitas non habet leges.*" And the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline well says:

> The theory on which the Acts of Uniformity were based, namely, that the public worship of the Church of England should be regulated by one forced standard, laid down once for all, and to be maintained in all places and for all time without excess or defect, has never been carried out in practice. . . . It has proved impracticable to obtain complete obedience to the Acts of Uniformity in one particular direction, partly because it is not now, and never has been, demanded in other directions. (*Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906, p. 64.)

A Roman Catholic divine, in a recent tract, describes the Anglican communion as a "city of confusion," because of the freedom and variety of doctrines and worship comprehended in it. We might retort that confusion is not the exclusive prerogative of the Church of England. The Church of Rome has her troubles with her unruly children, and we are constantly hearing of the holy father's stern discipline. The rod is not spared. But all this suppression of thought and action, this silencing of men in the interest of uniformity, is an unending process of violation of that liberty and variety, which are necessary for true vital unity and energetic progress.

The confusion of an agitated, yes, a stormy sea, is greatly to be preferred to the dull dead sameness of an ocean calm, without movement, without variety, without life, and without power. There is endless confusion when an army is on the march. There is uniformity enough when they are asleep in their tents. There is confusion enough when throngs are pressing into the Christian temple. There is uniformity enough when it is abandoned to the priests.

It is just this confusion of doctrine and worship in the Church of England, and in a measure also in the American Protestant Episcopal Church, which gives evidence of a vigorous life, a healthy progress, and a process of organization, which is rapidly proceeding onward to a greater and a more glorious future. It is the glory of the Anglican communion that, after generations of theological conflict, it presents one national Church in the midst of the world where Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Reformed, Calvinist and Arminian may feel equally at home. And it is the glory of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America that, in addition to all this, it has gradually incorporated the best features of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, so that those who stand for the old historical Puritanism find in it a better type of Presbyterianism, one nearer the ideals of the seventeenth-century Puritans, than in those ecclesiastical bodies which without sufficient reason perpetuate the Presbyterian schism; which, indeed, had its origin in a brave and noble contest against prelatical tyranny, but which has now to do with a mother Church opening her arms to welcome back all her children under the one banner of Church Unity, and on a platform which no ancient Presbyterian could have refused.

There can be no doubt that the Anglo-Catholic party has been in the Church of England since the Reformation, and that it can claim no less names than Queen Elizabeth and Charles I, Archbishops Bancroft and Laud, and the leading prelates of the Restoration. This party has its historic right in the Church of England since the Reformation, whatever any one may say as to its present positions and claims. And

the Puritan party has no call to make them uncomfortable in the Church, or to force them to choose between Catholicism and Protestantism.

V. FAILURE OF THE ACTS OF UNIFORMITY

The several Acts of Uniformity were made in the interests of maintaining the unity of the Church of England and of destroying every kind of schism. They were used against the Roman Catholics with great severity, because Roman Catholics recognized the supremacy of the Pope in ecclesiastical affairs. But the Anglo-Catholics during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries maintained the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical affairs, and were therefore indulged by the Crown and the prelates, and were not strictly held to the Acts of Uniformity. Throughout the history of the Church of England, the standing complaint of the Puritan party has been against the crypto-Romanism, which was allowed and even favoured in the Church of England. At the Restoration, the Presbyterian divines of the Conference of Savoy called the attention of the bishops to many of these ceremonies, which had been tolerated and encouraged; but the prelates gave them scarcely a decent hearing. They did not attempt to put a check upon the Anglo-Catholics; they exhausted themselves in persecuting the Puritans.

There is much to be said, therefore, in favour of the plea put forth by such divines as Gore, Scott Holland, Moberly and others against the decision of the Archbishops as to the ceremonial use of incense and lights. They say:

> We are nevertheless compelled to regard with the gravest anxiety the rigid interpretation given in that ruling to the Act of Uniformity of 1559, and continued in 1662, an interpretation which would, we fear, go beyond the matter immediately under decision, and which does make even so minute an usage as the saying of 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord," before the Gospel in the strict sense, illegal.
>
> We humbly submit (1) that neither the Elizabethan, Jacobean, nor yet the Caroline Bishops, whether before or after 1662, considered themselves to be thus stringently confined.

(2) That there were many important details given, which were afterward specified by rubrics in 1662, which were continuously practised, and in some cases enforced, without any rubrical direction, under the Elizabethan act.

(3) That the common law and usage of the Church should be always considered in its place by the side of the statute law. And we most earnestly plead that, in view of the complete change of circumstances which has taken place since the passing of the Acts, and in justice to the Church engaged in an immense and many-sided work, which is bound to depend largely on enterprise and experiment, the interpretation given to the rubrics should be as wide and free as their language will reasonably permit; and that a stringent uniformity, however impartially enforced, is the last thing which the needs of the day require. (*Appeal to the Archbishops*, signed by Gore, Scott Holland, Moberly and others, *Guardian*, October 11, 1899, p. 1360.)

There can be no doubt that the Crown and the prelates in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did not pretend to enforce the Acts of Uniformity against the Anglo-Catholic party. It is a question, therefore, how far customary law and usage may go as over against statute law; how far the neglect to enforce a law may give rights under the law.

It seems evident that the Archbishops in their decisions of July 31, 1899, and May 1, 1900, have given the correct interpretation of the statute law. It is impossible to give any other decision on the grounds of law and history. All the arguments on the other side submitted before the Archbishops, and made by Canon MacColl [1] and by Dr. Sanday [2] and others, are ingenious, plausible on the surface, fine examples of special pleading, but altogether invalid. The Archbishops weighed these arguments with the utmost care. It appears that they would have been glad to reach a less rigid interpretation of the law; but they could do no other as the chief pastors of the Church of England, when called upon by the whole Church to interpret the law. The argument that the common law of the Church should weigh over against the statute law is not a valid argument. The Church has no common law. The only law any Church has is statute law.

[1] *Reformation Settlement.*

[2] *The Catholic Movement and the Archbishops' Decision.*

All ecclesiastical law is canon law. Those who make this argument are misled by the usages of civil law and depart from the history of ecclesiastical law. The argument that the non-enforcement of a law against a party in the Church excuses that party for a continuance in disobedience is invalid. As Sir William Harcourt in his article in the *Times* showed, that is simply an evidence of "lawlessness in the National Church." The bishops have not used their prerogative, they have not enforced the law. As Harcourt said:

> They have for years shut the gates of ecclesiastical justice; they have deprived the laity of the protection which the law had provided; they have guaranteed the clergy against any penalty for any and every offence against the law of the Church, and they call this comprehension.

This is strong language; but it is substantially true. It has been a tradition among the prelates since the Reformation not to enforce the law against the Anglo-Catholic party. They did this, not in the interests of comprehension, but in the interests of the party which was always eager for the prerogatives of bishop and Crown. The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline state truly:

> Nor does it appear that any systematic attempt to enforce general conformity to the rubrics has ever been made except upon three occasions: (1) in the reign of Elizabeth, after the Advertisements were issued in 1566; (2) during the primacy of Archbishop Laud (1633–46); (3) in the period following the Restoration of 1660. On none of these occasions was the result wholly satisfactory, only a partial measure of conformity to the rubrics being established and even this not without secession on the part of many of the recalcitrants. (*Report of the Royal Commission*, 1906, p. 9.)

It should also be said that on these three occasions, only the Puritan party was constrained to conformity, and the result of that constraint was the nonconforming Churches of England. No attempt was made on these three occasions to constrain the Anglo-Catholic party to conformity; but on the other hand they were not only allowed, but encouraged to violate the rubrics in the interests of the doctrines and ceremonies of their party. Whenever spasmodic efforts for con-

formity were made at other times by zealous bishops, they were almost always directed against Puritans, and Anglo-Catholic irregularities were winked at.

A change came about in modern times in the interests of comprehension. The bishops ceased to enforce the law against the Puritan party, because they saw that such enforcement was ruinous to the Church. Historically, the Acts of Uniformity have been goads in the hands of the prelates to torment the Puritan party. As a recent writer in the *Guardian* says, "they were made against the enemies of the Church, not against churchmen." But he, as others, identifies his party with the Church, and claims that the Puritan party are not true churchmen. This is not historically correct. The Puritan party has as good a right in the Church as the Anglo-Catholic. However, the writer is plausibly correct, for the Acts of Uniformity have ever been used against the Puritan party.

It is one of the revenges of history that, after the Puritan party had gained the same recognition from the bishops as the Anglo-Catholic party, in the interests of comprehension, the Act of Uniformity should now be turned against the Anglo-Catholic party, through an agitation promoted by extreme and self-appointed champions of Puritanism. Ever since the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth until the close of the eighteenth century, the Puritan or Protestant party in the Church has been tormented by the Acts of Uniformity. One body after another has been compelled to abandon the Church of England, the Church of their fathers, by these Acts of Uniformity, interpreted loosely toward the Anglo-Catholics, but with rigidity and strictness toward the Protestant party. And so, as the result of these partisan interpretations, the greater part of the British nation has been excluded from the great Mother Church, and the Church of England and her daughters have become the Church of a minority of the English-speaking people. And yet a great section of the Puritan party remains in the Church of England to the present day, suffering all manner of hardships and wrongs rather

than abandon the Church of their fathers. It is well, therefore, that the bishops learned to be as generous toward the Puritans as toward the Anglo-Catholics, and refrained from enforcing the law. It was disorderly, it produced a condition of lawlessness; but it was preferable to the rigorous enforcement of a bad law, which for centuries had proved a constant peril to the Church.

As the Anglo-Catholic party has aimed at a reunion with Rome, the Puritan party has ever aimed at a reunion with the Protestant Churches of the Continent of Europe, with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and with the Non-Conforming bodies in Great Britain. This, then, has been the agonising struggle of the Church of England: the effort (1) to maintain the unity of all Christians in England in the Church of England; (2) of the Anglo-Catholic party to unite with the Church of Rome; (3) of the Protestant party to unite with the Presbyterian and non-conforming communions. This struggle has increased in intensity in our times. It is involved in the tide that sweeps on toward a Reunion of Christendom.

What, then, is to be the end of this struggle? Is the Act of Uniformity to be used in our generation to force a section of the Anglo-Catholic party out of the Church? Is it to be used to destroy the Church of England as a National Church and to break it up into several denominations representing the several parties? There are some who think it and who hope it, and who are striving to bring it about.

None of these things is likely to happen. The leaders and scholars of the Church of England recognise the great mistakes of the past; the mistakes of Archbishop Laud, who, in the interests of the Anglo-Catholic party, succeeded in alienating the Scottish nation from the Church of England; and of the prelates in dealing so cavalierly with the representative Presbyterian divines at the Restoration, when they had the opportunity, by reasonable concessions, to maintain the unity of the Church of England. In seeking to maintain the unity of the Church by an Act of Uniformity rigidly interpreted,

they forced more than two thousand learned and pious parish ministers out of the Church of England, and became responsible for all those evils which have resulted from the separation of the Presbyterian denominations since that time. So, in the next century, it was the intolerance of the bishops which brought about the separation of the great Methodist bodies, and the alienation of the Welsh nation from the Church.

The leaders of the Church are not likely at this late date to reverse the policy of centuries, and at the dictation of a few ultra-Protestants, limit the comprehension of the Church on the Catholic side. It seems evident, from the statements of representative men of both the Anglo-Catholic and Puritan parties, that neither party desires to pursue the policy of exclusion. They both seek comprehension so far as it is possible. It has now become evident to all, that the Act of Uniformity, strictly interpreted, makes comprehension impossible. A sufficiently lax interpretation involves lawlessness, and the disorderly situation that every parish priest, if bold enough, may do what is right in his own eyes. The Act of Uniformity is used to pinch the Anglo-Catholics to-day. But there are already signs that the extreme men among them are demanding that equal justice should be done to the Puritan party. We would hear all manner of complaints from the Puritan party if the Act of Uniformity were applied to their irregularities also. It is necessary that all parties should as soon as possible agree to a repeal of the Act of Uniformity, which has been for more than three hundred years the curse of the British nation.

It is an enormous gain that the leaders of the Anglo-Catholic party have come over to the same attitude toward the Act of Uniformity, as was maintained by the great representatives of Puritanism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. One may almost hear a Puritan Father speaking in these words of Lord Halifax:

> What indeed is the position of the Church of England under this latest addition to her burdens? She finds herself bound hand and foot by

Acts of Parliament of the reign of Elizabeth, by canons of the reign of James I, and by rubrics which have not been revised since the days of Charles II. She is imperfectly represented by a convocation which the State authorities will not allow to be reformed, and which can do nothing without legislative sanction of a Parliament which includes Jews, Quakers, Socinians, Presbyterians, Non-Conformists of every description, Agnostics and others who are hostile to the Church. She has had courts imposed upon her for the decision of questions of discipline by the sole authority of Parliament, without her consent. Her Bishops, Deans, Canons and ecclesiastical Professors are nominated by the Prime Minister, and the Church has no voice in their appointment. Every effort she makes to reform herself, or supply her needs, is thwarted by a powerful party in Parliament, on grounds avowedly hostile to the Church's well being. The opinion of the Archbishops is but a new band around the old bottles, bursting as they are with the revived life of the Church. (Address before English Church Union, *Guardian*, Oct. 11, 1899, p. 1380.)

One cannot believe that the Puritan party in the Church of England will take any very different position from this. With the combined force of both parties, there ought to be no difficulty in doing away with the Act of Uniformity altogether, and in gaining for the Church of England the same autonomy that was won for the Church of Scotland after the British Revolution.

It is quite significant that those who are working for a reorganisation of the Church, so as to prepare it for self-government, are looking for help, partly to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and partly to the American Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Protestant Episcopal Church has adopted many of the best features of Presbyterianism. The Presbyterian divines who composed the Westminster Confession and Form of Government would find the Protestant Episcopal Church, in many respects, a better type of Presbyterianism than the American Presbyterian Churches. There is, in fact, no way in which the Church of England can gain her independence save by organising herself into representative synods. It is thus another of the revenges of history that the Anglo-Catholic party, which refused the plan proposed by Archbishop

Usher and adopted by the Presbyterians at the Restoration, as their proposal for accommodation with the Anglo-Catholic party, namely, the "Reduction of Episcopacy into the form of Synodical Government," should now in their most representative leaders propose this very thing themselves. Why should it have taken two hundred years to bring this about? Baxter rightly said in 1691:

> O how little would it have cost your churchmen in 1660 and 1661 to have prevented the calamitous and dangerous divisions of this land and our common danger thereby, and the hurt that many thousand souls have received by it. And how little would it cost them yet to prevent a continuance of it? (*Penitent Confession*, 1691.)[1]

Some are so perverse minded as to suppose that the Puritan party and Presbyterians will gratify a revengeful spirit, and will obstruct the efforts of the Church of England to win autonomy under a synodical form of government. This is improbable. The Puritan party will not be like a dog in the manger. They will not go back on their own history. Whether the Puritan party is in the Church, or without it in non-conforming religious bodies, it matters little; they will welcome the effort of the Church of England to undo the wrongs of the past, and to remove the obstructions to Christian fellowship. The Presbyterians of Scotland, Wales and Ireland will rejoice in this movement and aid it in every way in their power. And especially will earnest, godly men in all Christian religious bodies, who are weary, as Baxter was, with the evils of disunion, be filled with holy joy and courage, when they see the Church of England adopting all the essential things in government for which their Puritan fathers contended; when they see her assimilating herself to the government of the Reformed Churches of the Continent and of Scotland. It inevitably raises the question to them, which cannot be put down, why they should not accept the historic episcopate, the then only remaining barrier, on the side of Church government, to the reunion of Protestants, and so at last effect the organic reunion of the Reformed Churches, the

[1] See Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, pp. 83 *sq.*, xvii. *sq.*

ideal of the irenic party in all the National Churches since the Reformation.

It may be said that a reunion based on agreement as to Church government and discipline can hardly be effective so long as there are such serious discords as to doctrine and worship. This is quite true. But, on the other hand, it is just in these departments that the history of the Church of England has been so instructive. So far as doctrine is concerned, there is practically no difficulty in the Church of England at the present time in the way of comprehension. There are theologians who hold, maintain and freely proclaim, on the one side, all the essential doctrines of the Catholic Church before the Reformation, only rejecting ancient abuses and the supremacy of the Pope, and the dogmas proclaimed since the Reformation in the Church of Rome. It is true that they have no legal right so to do. The Articles of Religion exclude, and were designed to exclude, these very things. And yet they manage by unnatural interpretation of the Articles, or by an assertion of the superiority of Catholic tradition to the Articles, to maintain these opinions, and no bishop attempts to interfere with them. On the other hand, Protestant doctrines are held, maintained and advocated with equal freedom, even in such extreme forms as would have been regarded as unsound by the Protestant reformers. Calvinistic, Lutheran and Arminian doctrines are equally at home in the Church of England. Right or wrong, legally, historically or ideally, from whatever point of view you may regard it, that is the situation; and it is impossible at the present time to change it. From the point of view of Christian Irenics, this is a wholesome situation. If there is ever to be a reunion of Christendom, comprehension in doctrine must be fully as wide as this. In this respect the Church of England is the beacon, the hope and the joy of the movement for the reunion of Christendom.

Now, it is just this situation as to doctrine that makes it practically impossible to enforce the Act of Uniformity as to worship and its ornaments and ceremonies. Those who hold

the Catholic doctrine of the mass must express that doctrine in appropriate ceremonies, with appropriate ornaments. Those who hold the Lutheran doctrine will also insist upon somewhat different ceremonies from those who hold the Calvinistic view. The toleration of the doctrine, the recognition of the right to hold the doctrine, necessarily involves the toleration and recognition of the right to the ceremony and ornaments which express the doctrine. On the other hand, those who hold the Calvinistic doctrine must also express that doctrine by the simplicity of the service of the Holy Communion, and by the exclusion of all but the simplest kind of ceremony and ornament. There ought to be little doubt that, historically, the Church of England is committed, in its Articles and in its Book of Common Prayer, to the Calvinistic view of the Holy Communion; and yet, in the ritual and the ceremonies and the ornaments, certain things are retained which are not altogether in accord with the Calvinistic view; and to these the Puritan party have objected from the beginning, and to them many object at present, although in usage these things have come to have a different meaning to the children of the Puritans from what they originally had.

It is evident, therefore, that there is at present a considerable difference of usage in the Church, and still more, a great difference of interpretation of the common usage. The rigid enforcement of the Act of Uniformity would strike both parties with wellnigh equal severity. The Archbishops have interpreted the law correctly. But it is impracticable to enforce it.

In the meanwhile the whole Church is aroused to get rid of an intolerable situation, and it will do so.

VI. THE ROYAL COMMISSION

The British Parliament in 1904 appointed an able and energetic Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline to investigate the entire situation. The Commission made a most careful and painstaking inquiry and submitted its report in

1906, with exceedingly full and valuable information and remedial proposals. They recognise that:

> Notwithstanding the issue of a joint Pastoral Letter by the Bishops of both Provinces enjoining compliance with Episcopal direction on the lines laid down by the Archbishops, it cannot be said that the Lambeth Hearings have attained the result at which its promoters aimed—the settlement of the questions which were at issue. (p. 63.)

They urge upon Parliament certain definite action, but nothing of importance has yet been done. So soon as the Church of England knows her own mind, Parliament will give her her will in the government and worship of the Church.

The Non-Conformists of England and the Presbyterians of Scotland and Wales and the Roman Catholics of Ireland may take advantage of the situation to demand the redress of certain grievances. They are entitled to such redress. It is a shame that these wrongs have so long continued. These redresses will, doubtless, be the price the Church of England will have to pay for her liberty. The Church of Wales will probably be disestablished for the same reason that the Church of Ireland was disestablished. But it is improbable that the Church of England will be disestablished. The Church of England will not be broken up into sects. It is quite true that many of the Anglo-Catholic party would prefer disestablishment to the long continuance of the present intolerable situation. The Puritan party and the great middle party will be forced to choose between disestablishment and liberty of worship. There is little doubt that the liberty will be given and the establishment will be continued. It is probable that the bishops will have to pay their price and give up their seats in the House of Lords. That might be, on the whole, a blessing to the Church of England and a gain to parliamentary government in England. Every one of these things counts on the side of liberty, of comprehension, of reconciliation, and of reunion. The inevitable result of this crisis is much greater freedom, elasticity and comprehension in the worship of the Church of England. The American

Church has led the way, and it may guide and help the mother Church still further in this direction.

The Royal Commission had their definite task with reference to the Church of England. They did not consider the larger problem of reconciling the Non-Conformists to the Church. And yet this problem must be solved before the difficulties of the Church of England can be removed. The Non-Conformists, still remaining in the Church of England, are only doing what the fathers of the present Non-Conforming Churches did, until they were compelled to leave the Church for conscience' sake.

The position taken by the Commission is sound when they say:

> It is important that the law should be reformed, that it should admit of reasonable elasticity, and that the means of enforcing it should be improved; but above all, it is necessary that it should be obeyed. That a section of clergymen should, with however good intention, conspicuously disobey the law and continue so to do with impunity, is not only an offence against public order, but also a scandal to religion, and a cause of weakness to the Church of England. (p. 76.)

At the same time the question arises how *reasonable* Parliament and the Bishops are to be in this matter of elasticity. The Commission distinguish between practices that may be tolerated and those which should not be tolerated. As regards the latter they say:

> Among the practices which we have already distinguished as being of special gravity and significance will be found the following:
>
> The interpolation of the prayers and ceremonies belonging to the canon of the Mass. The use of the words, "Behold the Lamb of God," accompanied by the exhibition of a consecrated wafer or bread. Reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration. Mass of the Præ-sanctified. Corpus Christi processions with the Sacrament. Benediction with the Sacrament. Celebration of the Holy Eucharist with the intent that there shall be no communicant except the celebrant. Hymns, prayers and devotions involving invocation of or confession to the Blessed Virgin Mary or the Saints. The observance of the festivals of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the Sacred Heart. The veneration of images and roods.
>
> These practices have an exceptional character as being marked by all

the three following characteristics: (1) they are clearly inconsistent with and subversive of the teaching of the Church of England as declared by the Articles and set forth in the Prayer Book; (2) they are illegal; and (3) their illegality cannot with any reason be held to depend upon judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or to be affected by any view taken of the constitutional character of that tribunal. Any observance of All Souls' Day or of the festival of Corpus Christi which inculcates or implies "the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory" or transubstantiation falls under the same censure. The arguments, based upon history and the usage of the Church before the Reformation, which have been urged before us upon many of the matters to which we have directed our attention, are, in the case of the practices to which we now refer, irrelevant. We desire to express our opinion that these practices should receive no toleration; and that, if Episcopal directions for their prevention or repression are not complied with, the Bishops should take or permit coercive disciplinary action in the Church Courts for that purpose. (*Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906; chap. x. 397–8, p. 75.)

Undoubtedly, this policy, if it should be adopted, would satisfy the great body of the Church of England. But what about the minority? There can be little doubt that a considerable portion of the Anglo-Catholic party would be constrained to depart from the Church of England for conscience' sake. This would still further weaken the Church and strengthen the numbers of nonconformists.

It would be much wiser to extend toleration so as to include all of these Catholic practices on the one hand, and also to tolerate the worship of the Puritan nonconformists on the other, for only in that way can the wounds of British Christianity be healed and the Church of England become the real Church of the English nation.

VII. LIBERTY IN WORSHIP

No nobler position has ever been taken than that of the House of Bishops at Chicago, when they stated the third article of the quadrilateral of Church Unity: "The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words

of Institution, and of the elements ordained by him"; supplemented as it was by the statement in the Declaration "that in all things of human ordering or human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this Church is ready in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own." This ideal has been endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, and is the common platform of the Anglican Church for reunion. This platform has reconciled many to the Anglican Communion. It should be used not as a merely theoretical ideal, but as a practical working ideal. They should endeavour to make the Church itself correspond with that ideal.

Uniformity of doctrine has been abandoned in the Church of England, why not, then, Uniformity of Worship? Uniformity in worship is as impracticable as strict uniformity in doctrine. Even the Church of Rome allows such of the Greeks and Orientals as have come into union with her to use their own historic rites and ceremonies. Rome would undoubtedly allow the Church of England the same liberty as a reward for reunion. The Church of England insists theoretically upon uniformity, and is bound by law to a greater uniformity than any other Church in Christendom. She would make a great advance in the direction of liberty if she could even return to the variety of usage in the different dioceses of England before the Reformation. The American Episcopal Church has revised the Book of Common Prayer, and removed from it many things objectionable to the Puritan party, and has inserted some things desired by the Catholic party, and allows considerable freedom in omissions at the discretion of the clergy. The Church of Ireland has also improved her Prayer Book. The Episcopal Church of Scotland has at last undertaken a much needed revision of her Prayer Book. The Church of England is still bound to the intolerable position of 1661. If the Church of England, is ever to make the Lambeth platform of Unity practical she must advance to the position of a regulated liberty of Worship.

It was a happy circumstance that the *Adiaphoristic* controversy raged in Germany at so early a date, 1548–55, in connection with the Augsburg Interim and the Leipzig Interim, and that the Lutheran and Reformed divines reached an early solution of the difficulty in the sound position of the Formula of Concord that when

"Ceremonies or ecclesiastical rites such as in the Word of God are neither commanded nor forbidden but have only been instituted for the sake of order or seemliness" are made matters of conscience "by a sort of coercion obtruded upon the Church as necessary, and that contrary to the Christian liberty which the Church of Christ has in external matters of this sort," they should be resisted at all hazards. But they also condemn the other extreme: "When external ceremonies which are indifferent, are abrogated under the opinion that it is not free to the Church of God, as occasion demands, to use this or that ceremony by the privilege of its Christian liberty as it shall judge to be useful to edification." (*Art.* x.)

This sound position saved Germany and the entire Continent from those controversies about ceremonies which have distracted British Christianity. And so the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the Continent have simple liturgies of a few chief types, with great variety in details, in the numerous national Churches. These variations continue in their daughter Churches of America. The German Reformed Church has long been in the enviable position of having a most excellent revised Calvinistic Liturgy which is entirely optional in its use, but greatly appreciated and widely used on that very account. The American Presbyterian Church has recently followed the example of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and adopted a highly appreciated, optional liturgy. The liturgical movement has nothing to lose but everything to gain by liberty of worship. That which is imposed by authority, however excellent it may be, provokes resistance. That which is freely offered is valued for itself. The most excellent liturgy and the most tasteful and expressive ceremonies of worship will eventually win general acceptance.

The Chicago Lambeth platform of Unity has made a valid distinction between the essentials and non-essentials of Christian Worship. Let the Mother Church and her daughters faithfully adhere to it and so promote liberty and unity of Christian Worship. Then all the difficulties of British Christianity will be solved, all the parties will be reconciled; and Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, Arminian and Evangelical, will partake together of the one holy sacrifice; and, while each will have his freedom in his own parish to use such ceremonies and ornaments and liturgy as will best express his own doctrine, he will not be offended when he partakes with his brethren in the use of other ceremonies, ornaments and liturgies. It is very desirable that the unity and peace of the Church may be realised in some such comprehensive position.

The rigid interpretation of the Act of Uniformity by the Archbishops seems to raise an insuperable obstacle in the way of Church Unity. The proposals of the royal Commission only offer partial relief, and threaten the rupture of the Church, rather than promise its reunion with other Churches. But it really opens the eyes of the Church of England to see the perils of the situation, and therefore initiates movements which will be fruitful in unity and peace.

The Worship of Christian Churches all over the world is essentially the same. It is composed of prayers, whether sung or read or said, of essentially the same contents. They have come down from the earliest times and have come together from many lands and many devout souls, whether preserved in liturgical forms or in the traditional language of extempore devotion. The hymns of praise are a collection of hymns of all lands and nations and Churches and denominations. The same Bible is read throughout the Christian world, and is used as the basis of all Christian preaching and teaching. Notwithstanding all the differences of external form and ceremony, the worship in all Christian Churches, as it rises up to God from every kindred nation

and tongue and is stripped of all that is external and unimportant, is essentially the same. It is doubtful whether the saints of heaven would discern those differences which seem so important to us here on earth. The odour of Christ's name gives efficacy to all the worship, however defective it may be. It all ascends in his name to the Father and the Father will not reject the Greek, the Armenian or the Roman, any more than the Anglican, Presbyterian or Congregationalist, or any other who worships Him "in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 23.)

XIII

THE ENCYCLICAL AGAINST MODERNISM

Pope Pius X is in the sixth year of his pontificate. He began as a liberal Pope, proposing to reform all things in Christ, and for about two years he seemed bent upon carrying out his ideal. But suddenly there came a change; the environment of the Roman Curia was too strong for him, and they persuaded him to follow in the footsteps of Pius IX, and oppose reform as the most dangerous of heresies. He began as a broad-minded, warm-hearted, tolerant, conciliatory, lovable Pope, the humble servant of Christ, popular with all classes of people, who were ready to rally about him with enthusiasm for the work of reform. He now appears in his attitude towards the French Episcopate and the Italian Catholic Nationalists, in the decisions of the Biblical Commission, and especially in the new Syllabus and Encyclical, as a mediæval curial Cæsar possessed of the very opposite qualities.

How can such a transformation be explained? Some see in him a man to be pitied for his weakness in the hands of an ecclesiastical Camarilla, who make him a real prisoner of the Vatican, because they do not permit him to see the truth and reality of the outer world, but only matters and things as they represent them to him. But the mass of the voters of Italy and France cannot make this discrimination; they regard clericalism as the great enemy of the people and the Roman hierarchy as the deadly foe, which must be overthrown at all hazards and every cost.

It is difficult for an American to appreciate the situation in the Latin countries, where the people are Catholic, but the

masses of the men are anti-clerical. We are accustomed to free Churches in a free State. We cannot appreciate this state of war, and the injustices and hardships that result from it. In Italy the people are so bitterly anti-clerical that the highest dignitaries of the Papal court have been insulted in the streets of Rome, and it has been unsafe for them to appear in public without the protection of that very Italian Government which they ordinarily ignore and despise. Under such circumstances, one would naturally suppose that the Curia would pursue a prudent policy. But they have chosen the reverse, and are doing all in their power to stir up strife all over the Christian world with a madness that is the sure precursor of ruin. They have issued a new Syllabus of errors, and an Encyclical against Modernism; they propose a new Inquisition: they are hurrying on the canonisation of Pius IX; they are even proposing another infallible dogma, the Assumption of the Virgin, and a recalling of the Vatican Council to enhance still further the authority of the Pope, and protect it from the supposed encroachments of modern States. Pius IX, by his arbitrary measures, brought on the destruction of the temporal power of the Papacy; Pius X is on the way to still more serious results.

I. THE SYLLABUS

The Syllabus is a collection of sixty-five statements which are condemned as errors. These statements are not, so far as I have been able to trace them, the verbal statements of any one, save the authors of the Syllabus; but they are based upon statements made by Loisy, Tyrrell and other Catholic scholars whose writings have been put on the Index. I have traced a considerable number of these in their writings; in no single instance are the exact words of these writings given; but their supposed ideas, with some of the principal words, are put into entirely new sentences composed by the authors of the Syllabus. It is easy to see what grave injustice is thereby done to these scholars. They are deprived of the right of

stating and explaining their own opinions; but their ideas are first interpreted, or, rather, misinterpreted, by their enemies, then put into statements which mingle their words with the words of their enemies, these being wrested and distorted; and then they are held up before the world as guilty of serious errors for these very statements composed by their enemies; and, finally, they are charged with temerity and disrespect of authority if they question the validity of these statements or disclaim any responsibility for them. I shall give an example. The twenty-second error of the Syllabus reads as follows:

> The dogmas which the Church gives out as revealed are not truths which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort.

Loisy says:

> The conceptions that the Church presents as revealed dogmas are not truths fallen from heaven, *and preserved by religious tradition in the precise form in which they first appeared. The historian sees* in them the interpretation of religious facts, acquired by a laborious effort of theological thought. *Though the dogmas may be Divine in origin and substance, they are human in structure and composition.* (*The Gospel and the Church*, p. 210.)

This statement of Loisy is careful, accurate and well guarded. It is difficult to see how any one who knows anything of Biblical Theology and the History of Dogma can doubt it. Those Roman scholastics who know neither Bible, nor History, and make the Scholastic Theology the universal norm, may deny it; but they had no right to misrepresent Loisy by leaving out the qualifying clauses which were essential to express his meaning. I have italicised the most important of these.

II. THE ENCYCLICAL

We cannot dwell upon the Syllabus, for we must give our space to a study of the Encyclical. This Encyclical is addressed, like all other documents of the same kind, to the Episcopate throughout the world. It is thus in a sense œcumenical; but it does not on that account belong to the

category of infallible documents: for the Pope does not therein "define a doctrine regarding Faith and Morals to be held by the universal Church." He describes Modernism, defines certain errors, and prescribes disciplinary procedure against them. There is no definition of doctrine, except so far as the condemnation of errors may be regarded as an implication of different opinions, which in many cases, at least, may be several and not single, and in no case a precise definition of a doctrine. The Encyclical, therefore, belongs to a class of documents, issued by the Pope, which may contain mistaken judgments liable to correction and change. The Canon Law requires that they should be recognised as authoritative, as regulating external obedience and submission in conduct; but they do not bind the conscience or require internal consent, involving submission of the judgment and change of opinion or conscientious convictions. A Catholic scholar has the right, and in some cases the duty, of questioning their validity, especially when, as is the case with this Encyclical, his opinions are misrepresented, his motives and character blackened, and he is threatened with ecclesiastical discipline on false or mistaken charges. He may do what has often been done in similar circumstances—appeal from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. It would be difficult to find an instance in modern history, in which the elementary principles of justice have been so thoroughly disregarded, as in the recent Papal decree of excommunication against the unknown authors, and all who assisted them in the composition of *Il Programma dei Modernisti, Risposta All' Enciclica di Pio X: "Pascendi Dominici Gregis"*; in which several representative Italian priests show very clearly that their views are misrepresented in the Encyclical. The Encyclical describes the opinions of the Modernists, and then excommunicates those who complain that the description is incorrect, and that without knowing their names, or permitting them to be heard in self-defence,

III. THE MODERNISTS

The Encyclical is directed against the doctrines of the Modernists. Who are the Modernists? The name is given by the Encyclical to those known as liberal Catholics throughout the world. I know of no previous use of the term as a party designation, except in the religious struggles in Holland between liberal and conservative Protestants. The terms "modern views," "modern men" and similar expressions are not uncommon; but "Modernist" as applied to a religious party in the Catholic Church is unknown to our dictionaries. Liberal Catholics do not, so far as I know, object to the designation, if it carries with it the natural meaning that they are modernists in their attitude toward Theology, as distinguishing them from Mediævalists; but they do object to the term if it implies the description given of them in the Encyclical, which they regard as a caricature and utter misrepresentation.

The Encyclical begins with an analysis of Modernist teaching. This analysis cannot be found in the writings of the Modernists; for, according to the Encyclical:

> Since the Modernists employ a very clever artifice, namely, to present their doctrines without order or systematic arrangement into one whole, scattered and disjointed, one from another—it will be of advantage—to bring their teachings together here into one group, and to point out the connection between them, and thus to pass to an examination of the sources of the errors.

The analysis that follows is, therefore, avowedly not an analysis for which any modernist is responsible, but one for which the Encyclical alone is responsible. The analysis of Modernism is this: "Agnosticism is its philosophical foundation," "the negative part of the system"; "Vital Immanence is its positive part." This is the illustration:

> In the person of Christ, they say, Science and History encounter nothing that is not human. Therefore, in virtue of the first canon deduced from Agnosticism, whatever there is in his history suggestive of the divine must be rejected. Then, according to the second canon, the his-

torical person of Christ was transfigured by faith; therefore, everything that raises it above historical conditions must be removed. Lastly, the third canon, which lays down that the person of Christ has been disfigured by faith, requires that everything should be excluded: deeds and words and all else that is not in keeping with his character, circumstances and education, and with the place and time in which he lived.

The Encyclical goes on to say: "There are many Catholics, yea, and priests, too, who say these things openly and they boast that they are going to reform the Church by these ravings."

Now, if this were a fair description of the Modernists, and it were true that there were many such Catholic priests, no one could rightly blame the Pope for issuing the Encyclical against them, for such opinions are certainly destructive of the Catholic Faith. But who are these Catholic Agnostics? Loisy and Tyrrell, the chief Roman Catholic liberals of our day, who are under severe discipline of the Roman Curia, are not such Agnostics. Their views are clearly stated in numerous published writings. Fogazzaro and the writers of the "*Rinnovamento*" are not agnostics. The authors of the *Risposta* say distinctly that this charge is false. If there are such agnostic Catholics, let the Curia proceed against them and no one can justly complain. But, in fact, they are giving a philosophical basis to the opinions of the liberal Catholics which, so far as it appears, is entirely hypothetical, devised in scholastic brains, which have formulated a category for these liberals which they refuse and disclaim; and they have proceeded against the above-mentioned liberal Catholics to the extent of excommunication, as if they were what they really are not. The Curia blacken their doctrines and characters, and then excommunicate them for being blackened. As Tyrrell says:

> It is plain that Modernists are, because logically they ought to be, agnostics and atheists. . . . The whole of this vast controversial structure is poised by a most ingenious, logical *tour de force* on the apex of a science-theory and psychology that are as strange as astrology to the modern mind, and are practically unknown outside Seminary walls, save to the historian of philosophy. Touch this science-theory, and the whole argument is in ruins. (*London Times*, September 30, 1907.)

Such a procedure against these Modernists has been recently justified by a member of the Curia, who said: "Well if they are not such agnostics they still are guilty of heresy in other respects, and therefore have no reason to complain of injustice." And this leads us to the consideration of some other descriptions of the Modernists. Modernism is represented as "the Synthesis of all Heresies." It is quite convenient, therefore, for any one so disposed to charge a Catholic scholar with being a Modernist, if he has written, or spoken, anything that might be regarded as heretical.

The next most serious charge against the Modernists is that they hold to the "intrinsic evolution of dogma." It is quite true that some liberal Catholics, like Loisy, make great use of the principle of evolution in their study of dogma; but many of them do not. As Tyrrell says:

> Liberal Catholics are not cast in one mould like Seminary students; nor are all admirers of Newman, or Loisy, sworn to a servile imitation of their views. I am in some respects much more old-fashioned than either, in other respects much more new-fashioned. (*Scylla and Charybdis*, p. 335.)

Tyrrell himself questions Newman's theory of development, and takes a much more conservative position. Furthermore, it is certain that the implication of the Encyclical, that modern Biblical and Historical Criticism is based on the doctrine of development, is altogether false. They are based upon an induction of truths and facts as strictly as in the case of any other Science. If critics have adopted the principle of development, it is simply because it seems best to explain all the facts, as they have been determined by induction. They are just as ready as are the students of Natural Science to accept any theory, provisionally, that seems best to account for the facts.

It seems quite evident that the Encyclical intends to classify all the disciples of Newman among the Modernists. I feel assured that this is not the intention of the Pope, but it is the intention of the scholastic authors of the Encyclical. The way in which they oppose evolution and development of dog-

ma, and the value of probable evidence and religious certitude, strikes against the most characteristic principles of Newman, which made it possible for him and his followers to be and remain Catholics. One of these scholastics, who is credited by rumour, sustained by internal evidence, as one of the chief authors of the Encyclical, is known as a lifelong opponent of Newman. I have it on excellent authority that a Roman Cardinal said that "if Newman were now living he would be classed as a heretic." This is not at all surprising. It is a thankless task in the Roman Church to be defenders of the Faith. The greatest apologists have been discredited in Rome: Bellarmin, Bossuet, Möhler, Schell and now Newman. It is a common opinion among writers on Symbolics that it is impossible for the scholar to know what Rome really teaches. The greatest scholars who build on the œcumenical documents and all official decisions of the Church, and think that they are defenders of Roman orthodoxy, are almost certain to be condemned by the ecclesiastics of Rome, who are determined to keep in their own hands the exclusive interpretation of the Faith.

It is impracticable to go through the document and discuss its details. This would show that the Encyclical is really a trap to catch the unwary, or indeed, any person who, in any respect, differs in opinion with the Roman scholastics. It will be sufficient to cite their own summary statement of the errors of the Modernist Reformers:

From all that has preceded, some idea may be gained of the reforming mania which possesses them: in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. Reform of Philosophy, especially in the seminaries: the scholastic philosophy is to be relegated to the history of philosophy among obsolete systems, and the young men are to be taught modern philosophy, which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. Reform of Theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma. As for history, it must be, for the future, written and taught only according to their modern methods and principles. Dogmas and their evolution are to be harmonised with science and history. In the catechism no dogmas are to be inserted, except those that have been duly reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding

worship, the number of external devotions is to be reduced, or, at least, steps must be taken to prevent their further increase, though, indeed, some of the admirers of symbolism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head. Ecclesiastical government requires to be reformed in all its branches, but especially in its disciplinary and dogmatic parts. Its spirit and its external manifestations must be put in harmony with the public conscience, which is now wholly for democracy; a share in ecclesiastical government should therefore be given to the lower ranks of the clergy, and even to the laity, and authority should be decentralised. The Roman Congregations, and especially the Index and the Holy Office, are to be reformed. The ecclesiastical authority must change its line of conduct in the social and political world; while keeping outside political and social organisation, it must adapt itself to those which exist in order to penetrate them with its spirit. With regard to morals, they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive, both in the estimation in which they must be held and in the exercise of them. The clergy are asked to return to their ancient lowliness and poverty, and in their ideas and action to be guided by the principles of Modernism; and there are some who, echoing the teaching of their Protestant masters, would like the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy. What is there left in the Church which is not to be reformed according to their principles?

To this we might add the query, What Catholic outside the Roman Curia does not desire one or more of these reforms? Unless I am greatly mistaken, a very large portion of educated Catholic bishops, priests and laymen in France, Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain and America are smitten by one or more of these condemnations. When now to this is added the condemnation of the separation of Church and State, and the denial of the right of the Catholic citizen "to work for the common good, in the way he thinks best, without troubling himself about the authority of the Church"; and the rejection of the principle that "to trace out and prescribe for the citizen any line of conduct, on any pretext whatsoever, is to be guilty of an abuse of ecclesiastical authority"; it is difficult to see how a Catholic can be obedient to the Encyclical and be a good citizen of any modern State. If an attempt were to be made in Great Britain, Germany or America to carry out those principles, it is certain that clericalism would be regarded as the great enemy there, as it is now in most Catholic countries.

IV. MEDIÆVALISM

The Encyclical is, therefore, a thorough-going attack on Modernism, not simply upon liberal Catholics, but upon all that is characteristic of the modern age of the world, in Philosophy, Science, Biblical Criticism, History, Education, and Political and Social Life. It is an effort to overcome Modernism by Mediævalism, by making the scholastic Philosophy and Theology of the Middle Ages the norm for all things in all time. The Encyclical is *thorough;* but, like many other historic examples of such thoroughness, it is blind to the consequences of such a policy. It brought Charles I and his ministers to the scaffold, and has destroyed many another brilliant career.

If the scholastic philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas is to be the universal norm for the Roman Catholic Church, the Roman Church thereby divests itself of Catholicity, for it sins against the established principles of Catholicity, "*Semper ubique et ab omnibus.*" It not only antagonises the modern world, but no less truly the ancient Church, which knew nothing of scholasticism; and still more Jesus Christ and his Apostles, who knew nothing of the principles and methods of the Greek philosophers. Apostolicity is the historic test of a genuine Christianity—not Scholasticism. The Roman scholars are fond of giving the logical consequences of Modernist theories; let them consider the logical consequences of their own position, which would change the Creed from "One holy, catholic and apostolic Church" to "one Roman and scholastic Church."

It is well known that Thomas Aquinas was regarded in his day as a heretic and a reformer. The Aristotelian philosophy was condemned at first as sharply as Modern philosophy is in this Encyclical. The authors of the "*Risposta*" claim that they are the true successors of the scholastic theologians, in that they adhere to their spirit of investigation rather than to

their stereotyped modes of thought and statement. So Tyrrell says:

> I have the sincerest veneration for the truly theological spirit of my earliest guide, St. Thomas Aquinas; but I have very little for the drilled school of theologists who invoke his name, and swear by the letter of his work to the destruction of its spirit. (*Scylla and Charybdis*, p. 350.)

The scholastic theology is built upon the Aristotelian philosophy as expounded espccially by the mediæval scholastics of whom Thomas Aquinas was the greatest. All Roman Catholic doctrines since have been stated on the basis of that philosophy and the scholastic methods of Aquinas. But the ancient Creeds were constructed with reference to the principles of the Platonic philosophy. There is a basis of union between the two, but there are also irreconcilable differences. The teachings of Jesus and his Apostles were on the basis of the Old Testament, and had no manner of relation to either Plato or Aristotle. Which is to be the master of theology, Aristotle or Plato or Christ? The Encyclical virtually dethrones Christ and enthrones St. Thomas as the vicar of Aristotle.

I said in a recent article [1] that Leo XIII had taken an important step in reform when he called Catholic theologians away from the newer scholasticism to the study of the greatest of the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas. I have not changed my opinion. But in fact this reform has been more nominal than real, for the reason that it has been obeyed only in form and not in spirit. Any one can see, who will study the systems of the chief Roman scholastics at the present time, such as Billot and Janssen, that, while they use the forms of St. Thomas and base themselves on his system, they really introduce into the system scholastic materials, new and old, which are not homogeneous with St. Thomas, but which make a heterogeneous system that St. Thomas himself would be the first to repudiate. How, for instance, can they adapt the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin to the system of

[1] Reform in the Catholic Church, *North American Review*, July, 1905.

St. Thomas when he expressly denies it. The movement in their hands is a sham and a fraud.

The Faith of the Church, according to Catholic doctrine, is a sacred deposit derived from Jesus Christ and his Apostles, whose substance remains unchangeably the same. The Church can only interpret it, and apply it to new circumstances and conditions. As I understand them, the so-called Modernists agree to that. Loisy distinctly says that "though dogmas may be divine in origin and substance they are human in structure and composition." [1] Tyrrell has returned to what he regards as the "earlier and stricter view."

> Understanding by "dogma" a religious truth imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection, it rejects the very notion of the development, and still more of the multiplication, of dogmas, and acquiesces cordially in the patristic identification of novelty and hersey. (*Scylla and Charybdis*, pp. 4–5.)

According to Loisy, the substance of dogma is divine and unchangeable, the structure and composition are human and changeable. According to Tyrrell, the dogmas are unchangeable because they are imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection; in other words, he does not recognise the theological form as dogma. It is just this distinction that the scholastic authors of the Encylical refuse to make. They dare not say that the scholastic form of the dogmas, and the Aristotelian philosophy that shapes their statements, were original, apostolic and divine; but, by failing to discriminate between the form and the substance of doctrine, and by maintaining that the dogmas in their scholastic form are normative, and that the scholastic dogma is unchangeable and irreformable, they really imply the divine origin of the scholastic form as well as the apostolic substance; and this, at bottom, is the whole quarrel between the Curia and the Modernists. As Tyrrell says:

> For the Middle Ages with their statical modes of thought, their crude conceptions of government and authority, derived from Pagan Imperi-

[1] *The Gospel and the Church*, p. 210.

alism, their view of physical law as analogous to civil law, imposed or abrogated at the will of the lawgivers, there was perhaps no other way of apprehending Christianity, which, however, is older than, and therefore separable from these categories. The Encyclical holds to such categories still, but, rightly or wrongly, the world has swept them aside; nor will any argument, however ingenious, which assumes their validity, receive the slightest attention. No such *instauratio omnium* need be hoped or feared. (*London Times*, October 1, 1908.)

V. THE NEW INQUISITION

The general description of the Modernists given by the Encyclical is so apart from reality, that the first impression naturally is, that the best way to deal with it is to ignore it, or to recognise it by agreeing in the reprobation of such Modernists, and affirming that they do not exist in "our diocese." This seems to be the present attitude of the American Episcopate. But the second part of the document prescribes a new inquisition and the organisation of a vigilance committee in every diocese, with the purpose of banishing from theological seminaries and the Catholic press and every position of influence, every one who has the least trace, or suspicion, of Modernism, or who favours it or condones it in any measure. If the plan of the new inquisition can be carried out, it is difficult to see how any but a genuine Mediævalist can escape. But it is evident that the plan is too detailed and too drastic, and not sufficiently flexible to make it practicable in many parts of the world; and it is certain that there will be an immense reluctance and every kind of passive resistance to the enforcement of these rules. It is true that it is ordained:

> That the Bishops of all dioceses, a year after the publication of these letters, and every three years thenceforward, furnish the Holy See with a diligent and sworn report on all the prescriptions contained in them, and on the doctrines that find currency among the clergy, and especially in the seminaries and other Catholic institutions, and we impose the like obligation on the Generals of religious orders with regard to those under them.

We shall wait to see whether the Bishops and Generals of orders will altogether comply with these commands. This great responsibility is thrown upon them without their advice, knowledge or consent. The Bishops have their rights in the divine constitution of the Church as well as the Pope, and these rights are protected by the same Canon Law that protects the Popes; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, these rights are infringed upon in an unprecedented manner by this arbitrary ordinance of the present Pope. All the Bishops are successors of the Apostles; the Pope is the primate of the Bishops as St. Peter was of the Apostles. A Pope should no more absorb unto himself the whole authority in the government of the Church than did St. Peter.

The Vatican Council, when it defined the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, at the same time asserted, as it could not fail to do without heresy, that this was "without prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which bishops, who have been set of the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the apostles, feed and govern each his own flock as true pastors." And yet in this Encyclical, the Pope, without consultation with the episcopate, but solely under the advice of certain unnamed cardinals and other members of the Roman Curia, issues an ordinance requiring a "sworn report" from the bishops as to their fidelity in enforcing his new inquisition. If that is not an usurpation of authority and an enslavement of the episcopate, it is difficult to imagine what could be regarded as such. If Jesus Christ and his apostles committed all ecclesiastical authority to the episcopate as the successors of the apostles, it is no longer exercised by them in the Roman Church; but their place has been taken by a Curial body in Rome appointed by the Popes and responsible only to the Popes, but without any divine rights whatsoever. There are the cardinals, who are really bishops, priests and deacons of the province of Rome, exalted to be princes of the Church; even the deacons being high above Metropolitans and Patri-

archs. They may have the divine right to govern the Roman province, but they have no divine right to govern the universal Church. There are also the generals of the religious orders of every name, monks, mendicants and brethren, massing all the influence of these associations in Rome with a local influence and practical authority transcending, and sometimes overreaching and overcoming, the influence of the episcopate scattered and divided throughout the world. The General of the Jesuits is called the Black Pope; more powerful than any one in Rome but the real Pope. None of these orders, none of these generals of orders, has any part in the divine constitution of the Church, and any part they take in it is in defiance of the divine rights of the episcopate. There are the hosts of *monsignori*, appointed by the Popes as their court officials, who have as their chief functions to transact as officials the business of the Church. These have no part in the divine constitution of the Church, and yet they take a very important part in its government. These three groups of officials are really the governing body of the Roman Church, not only the power behind the throne, but the power that so surrounds the throne that nothing can be done except by them and through them. Even the bishops only secure a hearing through them. Time and again an agreement between the Pope and visiting bishops has been overruled, and even denied after the departure of the bishop from Rome. The treatment of the French episcopate, during the recent troubles, has been most shameful. Again and again have their decisions been overruled by the Curia; and, finally, as I have it on excellent authority, their very names were signed to an official document without their knowledge or consent. Truly, there is no hope for the Catholic Church until this Camarilla can be overthrown.

The "Saint" of Fogazzaro tells the Pope of this essential fault in the government of the Church when he says:

Perhaps your Holiness has not yet made proof of it; but the spirit of domination would exercise itself also upon you. Yield not to it, Holy

Father! To you belongs the government of the Church; permit not that others govern you, suffer not that your power be as a glove for the invisible hands of others. Have public counsellors, and let these be the Bishops, united often in national councils.

Alas! Pope Pius X has yielded, as so many others before him, to this irresponsible, invisible and secret domination, and the bishops throughout the world are summoned to obey as slaves of their master.

The "Saint" of Fogazzaro indicates clearly to the Pope the four evil spirits which threaten the ruin of the Catholic Church: The Spirit of Falsehood, The Spirit of Domination, The Spirit of Avarice, The Spirit of Immobility. The Encyclical is evidently pervaded by these spirits, and shows clearly and unmistakably that the Roman Curia is determined, in the temper of these evil spirits, to resist and overcome any and every effort for reform. It would banish from the Church all the Reformers that are named Modernists; it would give them over to Satan, or to Protestants, or to another Old Catholic sect. It does not wish the Reunion of Christendom, the peace and unity of the Christian Church; but simply and alone a body that will be submissive without question to its domination in doctrine and life, not only by external obedience of conformity, but by the internal obedience of a submissive conscience and an enslaved intellect.

I have a great respect for the person of the present Pope and reverence for his high office; and I regard the Catholic episcopate and priesthood as a devout and noble body of Christian men, and the Catholic Church on the whole as in a sound and healthful condition, ripe for reform and ready to reach forth for the highest ideals of Christianity. The Roman Curia is the canker, the running-sore, of the Papacy, which is responsible for all the mischief. The worse it is the better, for it makes all the more evident the necessity of removing it at all hazards. I have said nothing but what hosts of Catholics of all ranks are saying at the present time, who are deeply grieved and heartbroken over the present situation. Once more the gates of hell are open in Rome, and

evil spirits of all kinds are broken loose to corrupt and destroy the Church of God. They will do incalculable injury to-day as they have in the past, but our Lord himself gave the reassuring word: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Mt. xvi. 18.)

XIV

THE GREAT OBSTACLE IN THE WAY OF A REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

It is a happy circumstance that so eminent, broad-minded and warm-hearted a prelate as the Archbishop of St. Paul should undertake to comment on my article in the *North American Review*, "The Real and Ideal in the Papacy," [1] and to answer the question, *Is the Papacy an Obstacle to the Reunion of Christendom?* We agree that the ideal Papacy is one of the chief principles in the unity of Christendom; we disagree in the question that it is the only principle, and also whether the real Papacy, as it has existed in Christian history since the separation of the Eastern Church and the Western, and especially since the separation of the Protestant Churches from the Papal dominion, has been an obstacle to the reunion of Christendom. The answer of the Archbishop of St. Paul to this question is in the most irenic spirit and with a disposition to make all the concessions that he can properly make in view of his doctrine of the Papacy. These concessions are, indeed, so many and so valuable as to make it evident that irenic Roman Catholics and Protestants are not so far apart as is commonly supposed.

I. THE PAPAL DOMINION NOT ABSOLUTE

It is necessary to discuss the difference between us in our conception of the ideal Papacy. I regret that I cannot accept the statement of my critic when he says:

> Peter holds the keys of the Kingdom. He is the absolute master. Whatsoever he binds is bound, whatsoever is loosed he loosed. His

[1] It is given in this volume as VII.

power extends over the whole sphere of the Kingdom, over all its activities; it is shortened by no power or rights confided to others.

I fully recognise the primacy of St. Peter and his successors in the possession of the keys of the Kingdom, but not their exclusive possession of this authority. How can any one do so in the face of the words of Jesus to the Apostles and to the Church? Jesus said not only to St. Peter but to all the apostles and through them to their successors: "Receive the Holy Spirit; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."[1] At an earlier date Jesus had said:

> If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. (Mt. xviii. 15–18.)

This is the Magna Charta of Church Discipline.

In the great Commission on which the authority of the Christian ministry chiefly depends, Jesus did not give the authority to St. Peter alone but to the entire apostolate and its successors, when he said:

> All authority is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world. (Mt. xxviii. 18–20.)

It is evident, therefore, that the power of St. Peter and his successors was "*shortened* by power and rights" given to the apostolic ministry and to the Church. Therefore I said, "The three constituents necessary to complete unity are the Pope, the ministry and the people, a threefold cord that should not be broken."

[1] John xx. (22-23.)

II. THE THREEFOLD CORD OF UNITY

The learned archbishop recognises:

> That there is in Christian unity a threefold element is true in a sense; the papacy, the ministry and the people make up the Church, the papacy cannot be thought of without ministers and without people, any more than in an organism the head can be thought of without members.

But here his metaphor misleads him, when he says:

> But that a portion of the ministry or a portion of the people cut off from the papacy can still hold that they are within the lines of Christian Unity is no more conceivable than would be the claim that certain members separated from the head or trunk, no longer deriving from the head the current of life and motion, are still parts of the physical organism.

To this it might be said that the current of life and motion does not in the human body come from the head but from the heart, and that the head is rather dependent upon the body than the body on the head. In fact, neither can exist without the other. But a society, whether Christian or otherwise, is something more than the physical organism of the human body; such a society, as history and experience show, may exist without an executive or even without a ministry; the only thing that is absolutely essential is the people that constitute its membership; they may combine in themselves all the functions of government except so far as they may delegate these to temporary representatives. For a social organism the head is the least important of the three—the head and ministry will perish without the people, but the society may live on without them if such a necessity should arise.

Surely it is going to the brink of dangerous error to say that the condition of membership in the visible body of the Church

> is union with the Pope the successor of Peter. . . . Priests and bishops there may be, validly ordained, deriving their sacred character from Christ, through apostolic succession, yet they are not of the Church unless they are with Peter and of Peter.

For the Catholic doctrine is that a valid baptism is the mode of entrance into the Church, and all that are baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity by the use of water are members of the Church and are subject to its jurisdiction, whether heretics or not. And all who are "validly ordained deriving their sacred character from Christ through apostolic succession" are bishops and priests of the Church and subject to its jurisdiction, even if schismatic and rebellious. I cannot understand how a Roman Catholic prelate can take any other position than this.

Even if the Greeks, Orientals and Protestants of every name be heretical and schismatic, contumacious and rebellious, they yet are baptised members of Christ's Church, and at least a large part of them have a ministry validly ordained, as Rome admits. Much the larger part of the Christian Church is separated from Rome. The successor of St. Peter rules over only a minority of the Christian Church. These separated Christians are organised as Christian Churches; they have multitudes of baptised Christians submitting to the government of an apostolic ministry; they have, therefore, two of the three principles of unity given by Jesus Christ. The absence of the third principle, however important it may be, is not so essential that it destroys altogether the unity of Christ's Church. We are entitled to raise the question whether the Papacy does not, in fact, violate the unity of the Church still more than they, when it absorbs into itself as an absolute despotism not only its own historic rights but also those of the episcopate and of the Christian ministry and people.

III. UNLIMITED JURISDICTION CONDEMNED BY HISTORY

The primitive Church does not favour, but condemns with no uncertain voice the claim for an unlimited jurisdiction of the Pope. The bishops of Asia did not recognise the sovereignty of the Pope when he strove to impose upon the Orient the Roman custom of the celebration of Easter, nor did

Irenæus of Gaul when, as Eusebius tells us, "he fittingly admonished Victor."[1] Victor was in this respect guilty of an intrusion into the rights and privileges of the bishops of Asia. Dionysius, the Bishop of Alexandria, writes to the bishop of Rome as a brother, seeking his advice, not as to a superior looking for a command. Cyprian had very exalted ideas as to the episcopate and the Roman see, but he refuses absolute authority. He said:

> For neither did Peter, whom first the Lord chose and upon whom he built his church, when Paul disputed with him afterward about circumcision, claim anything to himself insolently, nor arrogantly assume anything so as to say that he held the primacy and that he ought to be obeyed by novices and those lately come. (Ep. vii. 1–3.)

The Popes now claim the exclusive right to summon Christian Councils, but all the primitive Councils—all those recognised as valid by other Christian Churches than Rome—were summoned by the emperors and not by the Popes; and none of them recognised the supreme legislative and judicial functions of the Pope, but exercised these functions themselves, even to the extent of condemning a Pope as heretical.

There is room for difference of opinion as to the rights and wrongs in the divisions of the Church. Candid historians who rise above prejudice, whether Catholic or Protestant, recognise faults on both sides; but the fundamental fault in all these cases was, if I mistake not, the claim for unlimited jurisdiction by the Popes, and the pressing of that claim to intolerable despotism. It cannot be conceded that "in the Orient the cause was the pride and ambition of Photius first—and later in Michael Cærularius" —although we admit "the unconquerable jealousy of old Rome in emperors and courtiers of the new Rome," not, however, without cause in the ever-increasing pretentions of the Popes. It is far from the facts of history to say that "In Germany the preaching of Tetzel and the *Gravamina* counted for less as causes than the personal waywardness and recklessness of character of Martin Luther and the political ambition and inordinate greed of princes and

[1] Ch. v. 25.

barons." The Reformation was the inevitable result of the intolerable usurpations of the Popes which the Councils of Constance and Basle tried in vain to resist and restrict. The Reformers sustained by the Catholic emperor and all irenic divines demanded another Council to reform the Church. The Protestants declined eventually to attend the Council of Trent because their doctrine had been condemned already in their absence and there was no possibility of their getting a decent hearing.

If we should grant that the Roman Church had the right to continue to hold Œcumenical Councils after the greater part of Christianity refused its absolutism; and that it had a right to make binding decisions of doctrines of Faith and Morals, and to exclude from the discussion the representatives of the separated bodies that it regarded as schismatic and heretical; and that the only thing they can now consistently do is to invite the representatives of these bodies to a friendly conference in any future Council; then Christian courtesy as well as Christian prudence, in view of the vast importance of the reunion of Christendom, should induce the Popes, as I doubt not the Archbishop of St. Paul would agree, to strain the bonds of charity to their utmost extent; not to take advantage of the necessities of the Greeks as they did at the Council of Florence; or to decide the most important questions as they did at Trent before inviting the Protestants to appear as already condemned before them; but to give them a full, attentive, patient and loving hearing, with an earnest desire to remove all their difficulties so far as truth and honour permitted. The reopening of doctrinal and institutional questions already decided by papal or conciliar decrees does not in itself imply any question of their authority; but it raises the question whether these may not be restated, as many others have often been in the history of the Church, in such simple, comprehensive and irenic terms as to remove difficulties and win acceptance. I firmly believe that such a thing is possible, if only the one great obstacle to the reunion of Christendom could be removed.

The amiable prelate of St. Paul does not appreciate the serious difficulties that confront the Protestant mind as it recalls the mischief wrought in the world by the insistence of the Roman Curia upon its absolute and unlimited jurisdiction, and its reinsistence in a most offensive way in the attacks on Modernism and in the establishment of the New Inquisition.

IV. THE RIGHT OF REFORMATION AND REVOLUTION

The position that I have taken with reference to the papacy is that of many of the most eminent Protestant divines, such as Melanchthon, Grotius and Leibnitz, who, in their time, seriously considered the problem of the reunion of Christendom and earnestly laboured for its accomplishment. All irenic movements, however successful they have been in reconciling differences of doctrine and institution, have been wrecked on one and the same rock of offence. Those who recognise the historic and valid jurisdiction of the Papacy, in accordance with the teaching of Jesus Christ our Saviour and the consent of the ancient Catholic Church, are not thereby compelled to acknowledge an unlimited jurisdiction, such as was claimed by the Popes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We recognise the jurisdiction of the President of the United States, but that jurisdiction is defined by the Constitution of our country, and if he overstep these definitions we do not hesitate to condemn him and resist him. The American Colonies recognised the supreme jurisdiction of the King of England, but when he exceeded the constitutional limits of his jurisdiction and committed acts of oppression and tyranny, the American Colonies rebelled and in the Revolution established the United States of America as a separate nation. So in the Christian Church, the jurisdiction of the Pope is limited by the divine teaching of Holy Scripture and by the unanimous consent of the Christian fathers. This limitation is incidentally and implicitly contained in the decrees of the Vatican Council,

If the Popes transgress these limits, do they not justify resistance and, if necessary, revolution?

The great Reformation of the seventeenth century had its historic necessity in the failures of the pre-Reformation Church. For several generations the Church had been in throes of Reformation; not only in the struggles of a host of Reformers before the Reformation, to purify the spiritual life of the Church, but also in the efforts of great reforming councils, Pisa, Constance and Basle. But all in vain, the Papacy was the fountain source of corruption, and the Popes refused to reform themselves. "They shut the Kingdom of God against men. They would not enter themselves, neither suffer them that were entering to enter."

In Germany, Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, doctor of theology and professor in the University of Wittenberg, was confronted by Tetzel, a coarse Dominican monk, to whom had been committed by the Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz the sale of indulgences in Germany for the rebuilding of St. Peter's at Rome. His preaching and conduct were most scandalous. Luther, as an authorised teacher of the Church, was simply doing his duty in opposing him. But, unfortunately, Tetzel was sustained by an unscrupulous Archbishop, and finally by the Pope; and Luther was compelled to defend the Holy Church against the Pope himself. He appealed from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope well-informed, and finally to a Christian Council. What were the Reformers of Germany to do under these circumstances?

As Dr. Schaff says: "The Roman Church at the critical moment resisted reform with all her might, and forced the issue: either no reformation at all, or a reformation in opposition to Rome." The Reformers were compelled by the Pope to choose between a Holy Church without universality and a corrupt Church having universality; between the Pope and Jesus Christ; between the Holy Scriptures and the Church; between an enlightened Christian conscience and submission to an absolute, immoral will; between vital union and communion with the living God, and a communion with

God which could only be secured through the mediation of a corrupt priesthood.

It is possible that the German reformers should have been more patient; that they should have gone on waiting as did their predecessors; that Luther might have served his generation better by dying at the stake rather than by rending the Church. But, in fact, the German Reformers, in the interest of a Holy Church, became Protestants; and their protest remains valid until the Church of Rome shall reform itself more thoroughly than it has yet done.

The divorce of Queen Catherine from Henry VIII was an unholy deed, disgraceful to Cranmer and to the English Reformation. But underlying it, there was a principle of essential importance—namely, whether the English crown was to be subordinated to Papal authority and its interests sacrificed for Roman politics. On that question the Papacy was in the wrong; and the English people were not in rebellion against the Catholic Church, when they insisted that the supreme jurisdiction of the Church did not extend into the sphere of civil government. It seemed to most of the English Reformers that it was necessary to sacrifice Catholic universality in the interests of national autonomy. The Holy Church had been submerged in Rome in a vile Macchiavelian State. The Popes of the sixteenth century exhibited more of the spirit of the Cæsars than of the Apostles of Christ. The English Reformation at its start simply followed the command of Jesus: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's."[1]

The Christian principle of authority is the authority of love, the authority of truth and justice. So far as the successor of St. Peter held supreme authority, according to primitive Christian thought, it was a primacy in love. The Pope as successor of St. Peter was *servus servorum*, the greatest of all as being the servant of all. The Papacy had become by gradual usurpation the very reverse of Jesus' institution, *dominus dominorum*, lording it over kings and emperors to

[1] Lk. xx. 25.

an extent conceived only by the arch-tempter of our Lord himself. St. Peter, in spite of faithful warning, denied his Lord. He was sifted as wheat by Satan, but his faith did not fail; he repented, and strengthened his brethren as the heroic leader in the first establishment of the Christian Church. St. Peter's successors, in spite of like ample warning, could not resist the devil when he showed "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." The Papacy made a still more disastrous fall, which weakened the Catholic Church, retarded its growth for centuries and brought it to the brink of ruin.

England, as it seemed at the time, had to choose between the lordship of the Pope and the Lordship of Christ; between Canon Law and God's Law; between the liberty of sonship to God and the bondage of papal absolutism. It is possible to think that the English Reformers should have been more patient, that they should have used spiritual forces only, that they should have preferred death at the stake rather than have relied upon absolute monarchs and self-seeking courtiers, and be compelled to share in a reform which was, in its civil relations, downright robbery of God and murder of holy innocents. But, in fact, when forced to meet the issue, the English Reformers bravely met it. They determined upon Reform with the best weapons they had at hand. They sank deep in the mire of civil corruption, but they gave us a reformed national Church of England. The papacy cannot excuse itself from blame for whatever evils sprang out of the situation, which it forced upon British Christianity.

We are now in the twentieth century, not the sixteenth. The situation has entirely changed. Rome no longer defends Tetzel, or the abuses which provoked the Reformation in Germany. Rome has been chastened by the discipline of history. Every shred of temporal power has been stripped from the papacy. No country is in any peril of papal usurpation. It is true that in St. Peter's on great functions one has heard the roar from assembled pilgrims and clerics, "*Viva il papa re.*" But this is a theatrical display, a mere outburst of

clerical enthusiasm, having no reality in it. The present Pope Pius X has happily forbidden it. But in his recent utterance he is more absolute in his authority than many of his predecessors.

There were other and in some respects greater Reformers in the sixteenth century than the more popular heroes, Luther, Zwingli and Cranmer. Sir Thomas More, the greatest jurist of his time, Lord Chancellor of England, a chief leader of reform before Cranmer, resigned his exalted position and went to the block rather than recognise the supreme authority of the King in ecclesiastical affairs; a true knight, a martyr to the separation of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Erasmus, the greatest scholar of his age, regarded by many as the real father of the Reformation, the teacher of the Swiss Reformers, was unwilling to submerge learning and morals in an ocean of human blood. He urged reformation, not revolution. He has been crucified for centuries in popular Protestant opinion as a politic time-server, but undoubtedly he was the most comprehensive reformer of them all. John von Staupitz, Doctor of Theology, Vicar-General of the German Augustinians, the teacher of Luther and his counsellor in the early stages of his reform, a man without a stain and above reproach, a saint in the common estimation of Protestant and Catholic alike, the best exponent of the piety of his age, was an apostle of Holy Love and good works, which he would not sacrifice in the interests of the Protestant dogma of justification by faith only. These three immortals, who did not separate themselves from the Roman Catholic Church, who remained in the Church to patiently carry on the work of reform therein—these three were the irenic spirits, the heroic representatives of all that is truly Catholic, the beacons of the greater Reformation which is impending.

V. A CONSTITUTIONALISED PAPACY

The ground on which alone a reunion is possible, is that stated by the greatest of all Catholic peacemakers, Cassander, who in 1564, at the request of the Emperor Ferdinand and his son Maximilian, proposed a platform of reconciliation in which he urged the limitation of the jurisdiction of the popes, to that which Jesus Christ prescribed in the Gospel and the primitive Church recognised. The pathway to reunion is a constitutionalised Papacy. The policy of unlimited jurisdiction resulted in the forfeiture of jurisdiction altogether for the greater part of the Christian world.

The strength of the separated Christian Churches has greatly increased since the sixteenth century. The Greek Church is no longer in that terrible crisis which in the fifteenth century compelled the Greek Emperor to seek reconciliation with Rome, it has the great Russian Empire at its back. The Protestant bodies no longer are on the defensive in ruinous religious wars, they have the three most powerful nations in the world on their side, Germany, Great Britain and the United States. The Catholic nations are all feeble in comparison, and two of the most important of these, France and Italy, are in open war with the Papacy, in which the majority of voters, nominally Catholic, are arrayed against the authorities of their own Church; and in several other Catholic nations the incipient stages of a similar conflict are easy to be seen. I am not proposing to discuss the rights and wrongs of these controversies. In many cases, both in ancient and modern times, the popes have been contending for their just, historic rights. But the difficulty in many cases has been that excessive claims have weakened the force of rightful claims. He who claims too much is usually in danger of losing all.

When one contemplates the happy condition of the Catholic Church in the United States and compares it with the sad condition of the Catholic Church in the Catholic countries

of Europe, one can hardly escape the conclusion that the chief reason for the difference is that the papacy does not attempt to exercise such an unlimited jurisdiction in the United States as it battles for in the Catholic countries of Europe.

The policy of unlimited jurisdiction and absolute submission weakens the power of the Catholic Church. In a conversation with the present Pope a few years ago, we were talking of the obstacles to the reunion of Christendom. I said to him that if the obstacles were to be removed there must be freedom to investigate their difficulties. He said that all reasonable freedom of investigation should be given. If only the Pope would in some way make good his word and guarantee the Catholic scholars reasonable liberty of investigation of the great problems that divide Christendom and obstruct the unity of the Church, I am sure that a splendid array of Catholic scholars would spring up and, joining hands with Protestant scholars of the same spirit, the hard problems would be solved and the unity of the Church be secured. Scholarship demands liberty; it cannot thrive under a policy of suppression, and absolute submission to an unlimited jurisdiction, and immeasurable claims which may easily be extended to cover any and every traditional opinion of scholastic philosophy, mediæval law and patristic exegesis.

The claim to an unlimited jurisdiction by the papacy may be justly challenged because the papal administration is not sufficiently well organised to give just and valid decisions of all questions. It is not the pope himself who makes the decisions, but the congregations into which the Roman administration is organised. The pope simply endorses their action as an executive, if he does not veto it or postpone it. Under these conditions the pope is only nominally responsible, we cannot be sure that the decisions express his mature and final judgment.

These congregations are composed, as everyone knows, chiefly of Italians, and these in large part from Southern

Italy. From the very nature of the case they look at everything from a provincial and Italian point of view: they cannot put off the characteristics of their race, their nationality and their Italian training. It is not a question now of the pope, but of the cardinals and monsignori who reside in Rome and the other humbler members of the congregations who transact the business of the Church. They do not belong to the divine constitution of the Church, but to the human side of it. History and experience show that they are very human. The question is not of the jurisdiction of the Pope, but the jurisdiction of the Curia, of the black pope and the red pope, and of little popes of every colour and shape, who administer the affairs of the Church with an arbitrariness and tyranny that the popes themselves, owing to their more serious responsibilities, would not think of.

These counsellors of the popes are often not those whom he would prefer, but an inheritance from one or more previous administrations. These not infrequently advise him in their own interests and not in that of the Church; and they sometimes by indirection obstruct and thwart his policy; and they are ever especially hostile to any and every kind of reform. Entrenched in Rome and perpetuating themselves from generation to generation they are now, as they ever have been, the petty tyrants of the Catholic world. In any other matter than religion, Roman Catholics would regard it as intolerable that all questions should be decided by men of another nation with a demand for absolute submission.

When one considers the qualifications of the Curia one must admit their very great ability and learning in canon law, in the ceremonies of the Church and in scholastic theology, but they are sadly deficient in Biblical and historical scholarship. In fact, a very considerable number of the greatest Biblical scholars and historians of the Catholic Church have been and now are in discredit at Rome, and many of their best works have been put on the Index. The Curia is altogether disqualified to make decisions in an immense range of questions that interest the modern world.

Furthermore, the Curia is antiquated in its methods as well as in its organisation. These have nothing whatever to do with the divine constitution of the Church. It is entirely within the authority of the pope to transform these administrations and methods, modernise them and make them more efficient. The Pope has in a measure made great reforms in the Curia during the past year; but these are all in the direction of absolutism, not of elasticity and freedom. But as they are at present, a Catholic scholar has the right to challenge their competence in many things without disrespect to the authority of the Pope, and without raising any question as to the divine constitution of the Church.

I must think the Archbishop of St. Paul agrees with me in recognition of many of the mistakes of the Curia and of the Pope: but it is difficult to see how on his principle of recognising in theory the absolute supremacy of the Pope, the Church can have any guarantee for the present or the future against the repetition of these evils. The Archbishop says:

> Counsellors the pope will gather about him, vicars and delegates he will have, to divide with him the labors of his office, but the supreme master, and last resort he will ever remain.

If this statement be correct, the Pope is essentially an absolute sovereign with no one on earth to check his will; he may be a Gregory the Great or he may be a Borgia. Who can tell?

But in fact the Archbishop does not really hold to such an unlimited jurisdiction. In his discussion of details he agrees so closely with what I have said that I see no valid reason why we might not eventually agree altogether. I am inclined to think that he represents fairly well the real views of the present pontiff. The Archbishop limits the jurisdiction of the papacy by ruling out "Jurisdiction in civil affairs, and dominion over civil government"; by agreeing to a limitation of the papal domain to a limited territory, such as the District of Columbia, and by agreeing to a number of other

limitations with certain qualifications that seem for the most part quite reasonable. I cordially accept the statement:

> If purely civil matters are in issue the pope has no right whatsoever to give directions to Catholics. . . . That the question changes when issues under consideration are such as appertain to the religious conscience and demand solution in the light of religious principle. . . . That the papacy possesses no right to determine questions of science and philosophy, or sociology and economics; the realm of the papacy is faith and morals, that much and nothing more. The situation changes, of course, when speculation clothed in the garb of science and philosophy, of sociology and economics, soars into the domain of faith and morals and challenges the church within its own sphere.

If the Archbishop is correct, and I think he is, that the present Pope himself really holds to such limitations of authority, what reasonable objection can there be to put such and the like limitations in the form of a written constitution in order to keep aggressive spirits within those limits? Such a constitution would not deprive the popes of any of their Biblical or historical rights, but might save future popes, and more especially the Curia, from repeating the errors and blunders of the past. It would have prevented the issue of the recent Syllabus and Encyclica. It would prevent the issue of another Syllabus and Encyclica against Modern Thought and Modern Methods. It would do away with the spirit of falsehood and delation, the spirit of domination and persecution, the spirit of avarice and greed, the spirit of immobility and reaction—all these evil spirits which are now so powerful in the Curia as to overawe and control such a devout and high-minded man as Pius X. Still more, such a constitution would do much to conciliate many of those who cannot in good conscience submit to the papacy under present conditions. It would, in my opinion, remove the greatest barrier to the reunion of Christendom.

XV

THE PASSING AND THE COMING CHRISTIANITY

It is evident to intelligent observers that Christianity is passing through a process of change which is gradually transforming it. Provincial, denominational, national and racial types of Christianity are confronted as never before in Christian history with other great historic religions of the world; with various races and peoples unknown to those who formulated the current doctrines and organised the existing institutions of Christianty, and the Church is obliged to adapt itself to these new conditions and circumstances of the greater world and the greater universe as made known by modern Science. The Christianity of former days is passing, modern types of Christianity are springing up and asserting themselves, and we are obliged to ask what the Christianity of the future will be.

The Rev. Dr. Newman Smythe has recently published a volume entitled *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism.* This volume has an intermediate section entitled *Mediating Modernism.* These terms afford a convenient frame on which to discuss the subject I have in hand, although they need explanation and qualification. But it is just in this explanation and qualification that I may best under present circumstances show that Modernism, however much discord it may seem to produce, is really gradually dissolving the discord of Christianity and preparing the way for the Reunion of Christendom.

There is a sense in which Protestantism is passing. It is not meant that Protestantism is passing *away* as a temporary, transient, and in the great eternal of Christianity a relatively

unimportant episode, an abnormal thing, another of the failures of history, as some of its enemies would have it. Protestantism is not passing *away*, it is passing *on* and passing *over*, with all its great accomplishments for Christianity, into something higher and better, the ideal Christianity of Jesus Christ himself.

What is meant by *Coming Catholicism* is not so plain, for Catholicism in its very nature is a thing of the past. The Christian Church was Catholic in the second and third centuries, when the term gained a significance it has never lost. Through all history the Church of Christ has been Catholic, it is Catholic at present, and it will always remain Catholic. What is meant is, that the Catholicism of the future, the Catholicism that is coming, will be of a higher and nobler type than the Catholicism that has existed in the past, or that now exists in the present. We should banish from our minds those narrow views of Catholicism represented by such terms as Catholic Presbyterian, Anglo-Catholic, and Roman Catholic; and think of that Christianity which, while *semper ubique et ab omnibus*, is yet ever advancing under the reign of Christ and the lead of the divine Spirit, into deeper and richer religious experience, higher and broader comprehension of divine truths and facts, and more energetic and expansive Christian activities, as the Kingdom of God proceeds in its conquest of the world for Christ.

The term *Mediating Modernism* is true also in a sense, but with qualifications. It is easy, on the one hand, to exaggerate its importance, and on the other to depreciate it. It is not true that Roman Catholic Modernism is to mediate the passing of Protestantism into the Coming Catholicism. But it is true that Roman Catholic Modernism, in a measure at least, is mediating the reformation of the Roman Church, and thereby the transformation of Roman Catholicism into the Coming Catholicism.

I. PASSING PROTESTANTISM

What is Protestantism? The Protestant reformers thought they knew what they were about, and they certainly accomplished something in Christian History. And yet we are told that Schleiermacher, three centuries after the beginning of the Reformation, was the first to detect its fundamental principle. So writers of the same school tell us for the first time what is the essence of Christianity, or rather, its quintessence, as Loisy justly calls it: something which they get by distilling Historical Christianity and the Christianity of Jesus Christ and his apostles, until all that is characteristic of the Bible and the Church has evaporated, and nothing is left but a residuum that is not Christianity at all—an abstraction which never did exist, or can exist apart from the brain that first discovered it, or those brains which may be induced to accept it as a substitute for that Historical Christianity from which they have already broken.

At one time I was greatly impressed by Neander's antithesis, that Protestantism stands for *immediate* communion with God, Roman Catholicism for *mediate* communion. But reflection soon convinced me that this antithesis, like most other antitheses, however striking and taking they may be, is yet too simple to correspond with the complex realities of truth and fact. So far as there is a difference between the two great bodies of Christians at this point, it is a relative difference and not an antithetical one. I have conversed with many Roman Catholic scholars on this subject, but I have never met one who recognised this antithesis as valid. The only Protestants, of whom it can be said that they make immediate communion with God the only real communion, to the exclusion of Bible, Church and Sacraments as means of grace, are the mystical Anabaptists of the Reformation, the English Quakers, and modern Rationalists, who are not Protestants at all, whom Luther and Calvin and all the Reformers would have rejected without hesitation from genuine

Protestantism. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church repudiates the thought that it denies immediate communion with God. All the Catholic orders cry out against such an idea, the Jesuit order no less, in some respects even more, than the others. The recent Papal rebuke of Americanism for its exaltation of the active virtues over the passive virtues, and the Vatican insistence upon the value of the passive virtues of retirement from the world, religious meditation, long and frequent hours of prayer, together with the practice of the counsels of perfection, is an additional evidence of this. It is quite true that the Roman Catholics emphasise the mediation of Church, and priesthood, and sacrament more than the Protestants; but it is not true that the Protestant emphasises immediate communion with God more than the Roman Catholic, except so far as the common people are concerned. I do not hesitate to say that the Roman Catholic Church at this point occupies the more comprehensive platform, and one which is truer to historical Christianity, and one toward which modern Christianity in Great Britain and America is tending, rather than the narrower plank upon which an illegitimate Protestantism would have us stand.

The principles of Protestantism which have been taught by most modern divines, are the formal principle, the Authority of Holy Scripture, and the material principle, Justification by Faith. These principles shine forth from the very face of Protestantism in all lands, and in all its great leaders, and are distinctly expressed in all Protestant Confessions, however distasteful they may be to those who would be Protestant without these principles. Here again we are presented with convenient antitheses: the Authority of Holy Scripture in antithesis with the Authority of Holy Church; Justification by Faith in antithesis with Justification by Works. But are these antitheses altogether just? Were they altogether right at the time of the Reformation? Are they altogether true at the present time? Polemic divines, looking at the question from one side, may say, yes; but Irenic scholars, who look at it

from all sides, must say, no. It is not true that Roman Catholics deny the sovereign authority of Holy Scripture. It is not true that Protestant Churches deny the authority of Holy Church. So far as the authority of the Bible and the Church are concerned, the difference is as to the relative weight of authority.

It is indeed the irony of history that Rome has undertaken the defence of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture at the very time when it has been abandoned by most Protestants; a doctrine indeed which none of the Protestant Reformers ever held or taught, but which scholastics, whether Protestant or Roman, insist upon maintaining in defiance of the facts of the case. It is also significant that some people are going over to Rome on this very ground, that Rome is maintaining the supremacy of Scripture when Protestants are weakening its authority. So far as the authority of the Church is concerned, Protestant ecclesiastical bodies, in modern times, while denying the infallibility of the Church, do not hesitate to magnify the authority of the denominations in arrogant and tyrannical ways that would bring the blush even to Rome. Little popes are often more unscrupulous than the great pope.

The problems of religious authority, certainty, and infallibility, are difficult and delicate problems, which are in a more unsettled condition to-day than ever. These problems have not been solved either by Rome, or by Protestants. Neither side in the olden times gave the Reason and the Conscience their proper value. It is the great merit of the nineteenth century, in the reconstruction of theology, of which Schleiermacher is rightly regarded as the father, that it gave the Reason for the first time its proper place and importance as a religious authority of the first value. It was an inevitable reaction that led to an undue exaltation of the Reason, and a relative depreciation of Bible and Church. When the Reason has won its rightful importance by common consent this exaggeration will cease. The Coming Catholicism will recognise the divine authority of Bible, Church and Reason,

and reconcile and harmonise them in a higher unity, and in a nobler form of Christianity.[1]

It is only when you attach to Justification by Faith, and Justification by Works, the adverb *only* that you get a real antithesis, and then you mistake and misrepresent the issue between Protestantism and Rome. When the Protestant asserts Justification by Faith *only*, he defines Justification as a single and momentary act of God. He does not deny the process of sanctification, or the necessity of good works, although his exaggeration of Justification and Faith in human salvation does in fact tend to depreciate the valuc of sanctification and good works. The Roman Catholic does not assert Justification by Works *only*, but affirms that justification, is a process, in which, to quote the Council of Trent, "Faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification." The Roman Catholic asserts that love, exerting itself in good works, is necessary to carry on the work of justification to its completion. It is evident that here is a difference of point of view and of definition, and not of simple antithesis.

It has become evident that both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic positions are one-sided and inadequate. Protestant theologians who have the modern spirit, recognise the inadequacy of the older definitions. Sanctification and Christian love have not yet received their Biblical value, either in the Roman or the Protestant folds. It is necessary to look for the coming Catholicism in which Faith and Love, Justification and Sanctification will not be put in antitheses, but be reconciled and harmonised in a higher and better Christian doctrine of salvation.

Some theologians find the essential principle of Protestantism in the universal priesthood of all believers. This affords another striking antithesis to some minds, the priesthood of all believers, in antithesis to the ministering priesthood, which they call sacerdotalism. But this antithesis is no more valid than the others. It is quite true that Protestantism has

[1] See pp. 243 *f.*

greatly emphasised the priesthood of all believers, and has thereby done an immense service to the modern world. But it is not true that the Roman Catholic Church denies such priesthood, however much it may have depreciated it. The Council of Trent does not deny the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of believers, but the doctrine of those sects which dissolve the Christian ministry into this Universal Priesthood. The Council of Trent says:

> If any one affirm that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which is as an army set in array, as if, contrary to the doctrine of blessed Paul, "*all* were *apostles, all prophets, all evangelists, all pastors, all doctors.*" (Sess. xxiii. 4.)

All the Churches of the Reformation insisted upon an ordained ministry, in apostolic succession, having, in some sense, priestly functions. Protestants no less than Roman Catholics recognise a ministering priesthood, which does not destroy the priesthood of all believers, but conserves it. The controversies have raged about the question of the nature of the priesthood. This is involved with the deeper question, What is the nature of the sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist? At the Reformation the best theologians on both sides were ill informed as to the Biblical doctrine of sacrifice and the true functions of priesthood. They were misled by interpreting priesthood and sacrifice too strictly in accordance with mediæval scholastic theories of the Atonement. Modern scholars, who understand much better the Biblical doctrine of sacrifice and priesthood, look at these controversies as to a great extent astray from the real merits of the question.

Pope Leo XIII decided that Anglican orders were invalid, because the Anglican fathers were not ordained as priests to offer sacrifice. But the Anglican Archbishops claimed the reverse. It is evident that the difference between them was chiefly as to the meaning to be attached to priesthood and sacrifice, and as to the correct interpretation of the Anglican Ordinal, and the circumstances under which it was com-

posed and used. This difference in point of view is characteristic of the entire controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants as to the nature of the Christian ministry and the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

In the seventeenth century the Puritans battled against the Prelates of England for the rights of the Christian people, and yet the American Episcopal Church has advanced to the position in which the laity have greater representation in the government of the Church than they have in any Presbyterian jurisdiction. So the Roman Church has advanced and is advancing in this regard; and in some countries, even in Germany, the Roman Catholic laity are better organised and equipped for religious work than are the Protestants; and there is nothing whatever in Roman Catholic principles that will prevent in the future, a larger participation of the Christian people in the government of the Church.

That which Protestantism has given to the modern world is not to be estimated so much in terms of doctrine or theoretical principles; but in the reform of Christian institutions, the establishment in a measure of liberty of conscience, freedom of opinion and its utterance, the recognition of National Churches, the constitutionalising of ecclesiastical government, the removal of superstitious elements from public and private worship, and the emphasis upon personal responsibility for the religious and moral life. In all these respects Protestantism is far in advance of Roman Catholicism. But there is no infallible rule of the Roman Church which can prevent the eventual advance of Roman Catholics just as far, and even farther, than Protestantism has yet gone in these directions.

I might take up the differences between Protestantism and Rome all along the lines of institution and doctrine, and show that Protestant Theology is in a transition state, in a process of transformation into something higher and better in the Coming Catholicism. No one can exaggerate the great benefits the Protestant Reformation has conferred

upon the modern world; no one should undervalue the vast achievements of the modern Christian denominations in their maintenance, even though in one-sidedness, of important elements of Christian truth and Christian life. None of these will ever pass away, but all of them will pass over as contributions to the larger and greater whole.

In all such transitions there is peril, anxiety, and a certain amount of destruction of old landmarks and the ruin of valued establishments. But we should learn from the past; and not lose our courage, or forfeit our manhood, but bravely grapple with the difficulties of the situation, suffer with patience the inevitable consequences of a sure succession of disasters, and be content and thankful for a few successes; for the Coming Catholicism with all its glories is sure. We ourselves, and all things about us, are in the grasp of an unerring hand, which will in the end overcome all difficulties, and firmly establish the kingdom of God in a greater and grander position. Why should Protestantism stand off in aloofness like the elder brother of the parable, wishing the other brother to go on his way to perdition? We should look forward with joy and confidence to the time when both brothers shall be reconciled in the one household of God.

The question is often asked, How may we bridge the gulf between Protestantism and Rome? It cannot be done on the level of past controversies, or of present differences. How has the East River been bridged? At first two huge towers are built on each side of the river, then a slender wire is stretched from the top of these towers; this wire gives place to cables, then a foot bridge is made at this great elevation. Then months of labor are necessary from this higher level before there can be constructed at the lower level the great highway which combines the two sides in permanent union. So will it be with the Church. We must rise above the present low level of doctrine and institution into higher and more comprehensive positions, and then some Reformer, called of God, will discern some simple principle which will

become the first line across the chasm, and then the bridge will follow in good time.

The antitheses of the sixteenth century are to a great extent antitheses of one-sidedness, which the modern world has outgrown. The world has moved since then. The world has learned many things. We have new views of God's universe. We have new scientific methods. We have an entirely different psychology and philosophy. Our education is much more scientific, much more thorough, much more accurate, much more searching, much more comprehensive. All along the line of life, institution, dogma, morals, new situations are emerging, new questions pressing for solution; the perspective is changed, the lights and shadows are differently distributed. We are in a state of enormous transition, changes are taking place whose results it is impossible to foretell—reconstruction is in progress on the grandest scale. Out of it all will spring, in God's own time, a rejuvenated, a reorganised, a truly universal Christianity, combining in a higher unity all that is true and real and worthy in the various Churches which now divide the world.

The great temple of Christianity has not yet reached its completion, it is in course of erection. The builders are separated in different bands under different leaders, building up its great walls over against each other. The time is at hand when they must be united. Some more comprehensive principles will appear, which will be as it were the ribs of a great dome that will overarch the whole and combine all sides in the one Apostolic Catholic Church.

II. THE MEDIATING MODERNISM

Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church is mediating, not in the sense of opening up a way of mediation between Roman and Protestant Christianity, but as mediating between the Mediæval Scholastic Catholicism, which still, to so great an extent, dominates the Roman Catholic Church, and the Coming Catholicism.

Modernism still continues to agitate the Roman Catholic Church, and will continue its work until it accomplishes its Providential mission. It is, indeed, in some respects the most important religious movement since the great Reformation of the sixteenth century; for it is not confined to the Roman Catholic Church, but is world-wide in its sweep, influencing more or less all Christian Churches, and in a measure all the great religions of the world. Modernism is, essentially, the spirit of the modern age, and especially the resultant of the many forces which have been working with extraordinary complexity and intricacy during the previous century, and which are rapidly approaching a climax that probably will produce one of the greatest Revolutions and Reformations of History.

The battle between Modernism and the Papacy is raging all over the Christian world. The despotic attempts of the Curia to crush it have been vain. Some of the most eminent Catholic scholars have been put under the ban, others have been excommunicated; numbers have been suspended from their priestly functions. Many more have been removed from important positions of usefulness to other less important positions where it was supposed they could do little harm. Great numbers have been simply silenced. What does this all amount to, however, but attempts to smother a flame which still burns fiercely? The attempts to scatter it only increase the number of conflagrations.

There are signs that a reaction has already begun. Some of the most distinguished prelates of Italy, France and Germany have rebuked the most offensive spies and detractors of their brethren, whom this sad controversy has brought to the front. Even the Pope is said to have uttered words of caution. The public press of the world is boiling with indignation because of the arrogant dictation, and impertinent interference with their affairs, of Monsignore Benigni, the protégé of Cardinal Merry del Val, and his "*Correspondenza Romana.*" There is profound dissatisfaction with the present situation of the Church all over the Christian world, and on

the part of some of the most distinguished Cardinals and prelates. It is becoming more and more evident that the Pope has been systematically deceived.

The Pope, nominally the sovereign of the Church, is really now, as previous Popes have usually been, in the hands of a bureaucracy which in its own interests constantly misleads him in the most important matters. If such a strong self-centred man as Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany, constantly in public, and travelling hither and thither in Germany and other countries, has been misled to his shame by unprincipled German bureaucrats; how much easier has it been for Roman bureaucrats, representing to so great an extent religious Orders rather than the Episcopate, and thinking ever chiefly of the interests of their Orders—how much easier for such men to mislead such a Pope as Pius X, a simple-minded, devout man, with the best intentions for moral and religious reform, but without diplomatic experience and inexpert in the detection of intrigues. He remains shut up in the Vatican, carefully guarded from all improper associations, courted by adoring pilgrims and obsequious officials. He does not, and cannot, know any more of the outer world than is strained out to him through the screens of a multitude of flatterers and self-seekers. The few candid and straightforward men who are admitted to brief interviews are drowned, as it were, in the ocean of flatterers, and the frank words of the Pope to these are always denied or explained away in the official journals. As Sabatier says, "One need not be a modernist to be ashamed of this *Camorra* who have practically substituted themselves for the person of the Pontiff, and are clamourously forcing their will upon the Church."

Russia and Turkey, and even Persia and China, have been compelled by the modern spirit to constitutionalise their Governments and so destroy bureaucracy and despotism. It is really impossible for Rome to resist much longer this modern spirit. Rome cannot long remain the only absolute despotism on the face of the earth. What the Roman Curia is now battling for is its own despotic authority. The real

secret of its outcry against Modernism is the dread lest Rome may be compelled to tread the footsteps of all modern States.

The Pope has undoubtedly made great reforms, such as the reform of public worship in the interests of reverence and dignity; the reform of the Curia and the reorganisation of its congregations to increase their efficacy; the consolidation of seminaries for the priesthood, and the enlargement and improvement of their studies; the removal of the American Catholics from a missionary jurisdiction to the direct Papal jurisdiction; and the recodification of the Canon Law which is about to be published. Few Popes have accomplished so much in a little time. And yet all these reforms have been in the interest of the government and discipline of the Church and in the direction of absolutism and Mediæval conceptions of the Papacy. The Pope has not carried out his programme of restoring all things in Christ. He has been diverted to the bureaucratic interest of restoring all things to the Papacy.

This Mediævalism in government and discipline has inevitably carried with it Mediævalism in doctrines of Faith and Morals, and so the conflict with Modernism became inevitable.

The Modernists in the Roman Catholic Church are Modernists in that they use modern methods in theology. They do not differ from Mediævalists in the doctrines of the Church, but only in the form and mode of stating them and vindicating them. Mediævalists insist that the scholastic form of the doctrine must be maintained as well as the doctrine itself. This is precisely the same conflict that has been in progress all over the Protestant world between Protestant scholasties and progressive Protestants; between those who insist that the scholastic formulas of the seventeenth century should be binding, as well as the doctrines contained in them. The Protestant scholastics and the Roman Curia see eye to eye in this fight. Progressive Protestants and Catholic Modernists are lined up in the same ranks. In other words, it is no longer a battle between Protestants and Roman Catholics, between Lutheran and Reformed, between Arminian and

Calvinist, or even between High Church and Low Church in the different denominations. The battle cries of the seventeenth century, even those of the sixteenth century, are no longer those that excite the world. Modernists, Protestant and Catholic alike, are characterised by these same things.

(1) Modernists use the method of Biblical Criticism and accept its results without hesitation. This method destroys a number of false views of the Bible; it affects no official doctrines of the Bible of any Church, Roman, Greek or Protestant. Scholastics, Roman and Protestant, agree in the new dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture which Modernists, Protestant and Roman Catholic, deny.

(2) Modernists study Church History by the methods of Historical Criticism. This destroys a multitude of untenable positions. We have to do here, not with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the use of apostolic tradition alongside of the Bible as an authority in religion, but with traditional history entirely apart from apostolic foundations. Scholastics, Roman and Protestant alike, insist on traditional history. All Modernists insist upon the elimination of historic fact from the traditional theories in which it is too often shrouded.

(3) Modernists study dogmas by the use of Modern Philosophy. Modern Philosophy discredits the scholastic formulas in which both Roman and Protestant dogmas are encased; it does not discredit the dogmas themselves, but endeavours to set them in modern formulas that can be understood by modern men.

(4) Modernists accept without hesitation the results of Modern Science. They usually adopt the principle of evolution, with its valuable consequences. Scholastics, Protestant and Roman, tend to the opinion, baldly expressed by the late Dr. Begg, that all Theology was given to Adam and Eve in Eden, or at least as a sacred deposit to the founders of Christianity. All Modernists see in Church History a development, or evolution, of institution and doctrine.

(5) Modernists advocate a reform of the Church and its institutions in accordance with modern methods of govern-

ment and discipline, and with scientific, social and economic principles. They practise the active rather than the passive virtues, and urge more comprehensiveness and efficiency in religious work. This involves practical reform all along the line. As the Encyclical says: There is nothing that the Modernists would leave untouched. The scholastics, Protestant and Roman, are hostile to reform.

It is evident that Christianity has, in this conflict between Mediævalists and Modernists, entirely new lines of cleavage. The old lines have become indistinct, the new lines are rapidly obliterating them. What is that, but to say that both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are moving onward, impelled by irresistible forces, to a future which not even the Pope can determine? Are they drifting to destruction? Or are they guided by the Master pilot to a safe and sure haven? Modernism is the embodiment of the *Zeit-Geist*, the spirit of our age, that our Lord is using to mediate between the past and the future of his kingdom.

Modernists differ greatly among themselves, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. There are radical Modernists who are impatient of the slow processes of scholarship and jump at conclusions. In their enthusiasm for the new, they become hostile to the old; and so they become revolutionary in their notions. Such Modernists discredit the movement. No one should blame the Pope for smiting them; no one should blame Protestant religious organisations for rejecting them. But, in fact, the chief Roman Catholic Modernists, as the chief Protestant Modernists, are not such radicals.

Ecclesiastics have no fear of radicals, for they know that these are madly rushing to their own destruction; but they have an instinctive hatred of reform of any kind, and therefore conservative reformers are their terror, because they are conscious of the need of such reforms and know quite well that they can only postpone them. The Modernists, who have been smitten by the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches alike, are for the most part, not radicals, but conservatives, differing from their adversaries more in methods and struc-

tural principles than in substance and ideals—more as regards current traditional opinion, than with reference to the official doctrines and institutions of the bodies to which they belong.

The attack of the ecclesiastics upon conservative Modernists, in every case, has strengthened the hands of the radicals and stayed the hands of those scholars who were mediating the reconciliation of the Church with the modern world, and the advance of the Church to a higher and better future, by the use of the more comprehensive and efficient methods of modern thought and modern life.

The battle that is raging all over the world is between Mediævalism and Modernism. Even the Protestant Reactionaries are Mediævalists in part, because it is the mediæval scholastic methods for which they battle. It is the same battle over again which mediæval men had to fight against the exaggerated claims for Antiquity; which each generation in a measure has to fight against the preceding generation which would hold it in bondage. The Middle Age of the world had its work to do, and in doing it would not be trammelled by the methods of Antiquity. Mediævalism conquered in its day, and has dominated the Roman Catholic Church, and in a measure Protestantism ever since. So the Modern Age of the world has its task, and it will perform it without being bound by the methods of the Mediævalists; a task vastly higher and greater than that of any previous time in the world's history; a task in which the entire world is involved, and the entire universe must be held in view, and the entire history of the earth and man and the universe comes into play. Thomas Aquinas, with all his wondrous ability, his scholarly grasp of material and his constructive genius, was in many respects a babe to modern scholarship, whose horizon of knowledge is vastly more extended, whose material is enormously greater, and whose constructive system must be immensely higher, deeper, broader and wonderfully complex.

The tasks set before the modern world are not merely those of human enterprise and invention, they have been appointed by the Sovereign of the whole earth. The problems set before

the Church of Christ in our day are problems which Jesus Christ our King has given us to solve. The divine Spirit is in the Church of to-day just as truly as He was in the ancient and mediæval Church, and He is guiding us in all our movements toward the ideal, predetermined from all eternity in the divine plan and purpose. Uzzah once more thinks he can stay the ark of God from falling. Thomas once more doubts the presence of his Lord. The ark of God will protect itself in this modern age just as surely as in the ancient and Middle Ages. Thomas will eventually have to acknowledge his Lord in modern, no less than in ancient and mediæval History.

Modernism is not the antithesis of Mediævalism. It is its normal resultant. The Encyclical makes them antithetical. I shall not deny that there are some who call themselves Modernists who do the same; but these men are not true Modernists. True Modernists are mediating Modernists Modernism mediates the transition of the Middle Age of the world into the Future Age, just as the Middle Age mediated the transition of the Ancient into the Modern. All History is one, because it is governed by the master mind that created and governs the universe. All History advances steadily and surely toward its goal, as the militant Church becomes more and more triumphant. The chief Captain of our Salvation assures the modern world of an eventual victory. We may battle, and suffer, and die in confidence that the goal will be surely reached. Neither the reactionaries nor the revolutionaries will prevail. The Church of God moves onward with stately and invincible step—*Ohne Hast, ohne Rast*—into our future as into every preceding future, with the Lord's prayer, "Thy Kingdom Come" in its heart.

III. THE COMING CATHOLICISM

What is the Coming Catholicism? No one can tell in detail; but it is not difficult to determine in outline what the kingdom of God will eventually become, for we know in a measure at least the mind of our Lord, which is as certain of

realisation as the rising of the sun. We also know the great historic movements of the Church for nineteen centuries, and the forces which are now active in Christianity. These movements and forces, guided by the divine Spirit, will most certainly have resultants which we may discern with confidence.

(1) The Coming Catholicism will be a Church *at peace with itself*. Jesus said in his farewell discourse: "The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to remembrance all that I said unto you. Peace I leave unto you, My Peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be fearful." [1] A Church, guided by the divine Spirit, sins against the Master when it is fearful or troubled, and not at peace with itself. The guilt of this sin is the fundamental trouble with the Christian Church to-day. The peace of the Church should flow on as a river under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Instead of this, the Church of Christ has been too often "like the troubled sea; for it cannot rest, and its waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." [2]

Why should the Christian Church be so fearful of errors in theology, so troubled with schisms, so much at war with itself as to questions of government, discipline and worship? The Truth is mighty and it will prevail. Facts are invincible. The Holy Spirit is the inerrant guide given us by our Saviour. Let truth and fact do their battle against error and theorising. Above all, have confidence in the presence, the power and the guidance of the divine Spirit. The great fault of the Church of our day is that, while it holds to the doctrine of the divine Spirit, it does not act as if the divine Spirit was really present and guiding as Jesus promised. The Coming Catholicism will be a Catholicism which is conscious of the divine Spirit in her midst, which will act under His impulse and guidance, and which will be without fear or trouble, at peace with herself.

[1] John xiv. 26–27. [2] Isaiah lvii. 20–21.

(2) The Coming Catholicism will be a *reunited Church.* The Church of Christ has never, in fact, altogether lost its unity. As St. Paul tells us: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all." [1] The Church of Christ is divided as a household is divided with quarrelsome children; or as a nation is divided by warring factions. We have been so much occupied by our divisions that we have too often forgotten that we belong to the *one* household of God, the *one* kingdom of Christ. We have exaggerated the discord and depreciated the concord; we have misunderstood and misrepresented our brethren.

Several years go, an eminent Waldensian in Rome said to me that there was not a single Roman Catholic scholar who understood the Waldensian position. I thought at the time that it would be difficult to find a Protestant scholar who understood altogether the Roman Catholic position. The Roman Catholics and the Protestants live in a different literary world, in a different religious atmosphere; and it is necessary for a Protestant to enter the Roman Catholic world, live in the Roman Catholic atmosphere, and so come into loving communion with his Roman Catholic brethren, in order to understand them. The Modernists, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, have in some measure this irenic spirit. They see that the consensus of the Church is vastly more important than the dissensus; that the consensus is the normal and legitimate inheritance of Christianity, but that the dissensus is, to a great extent, the crude, undigested and unwholesome encumbrance of Christianity which must either be cast off or revised or reformed. We may be certain that this dissensus will continue to decrease in importance, that the misunderstandings and misinterpretations will gradually pass away.

As Harnack recently said: "Scholars in both Churches are engaged with marked independence in the solution of par-

[1] Eph. iv. 4–6.

ticular historical problems, and the value of their researches is recognised in both camps." A prominent Roman Catholic scholar, Monsignor Duchesne, one of the greatest living Church historians, recently published a Church History of the first three centuries, calmly discussing all disputed questions, such as the formation of the Creeds, the Christological and Trinitarian controversies, the origin of the Episcopate and the Roman Primacy, and the history of the New Testament Canon; and, "with the exception of a few details," as Harnack says: Nothing in this work can call forth the criticism of Protestant savants.

Harnack rightly urges upon conscientious men in both Churches the following admirable principles: (*a*) The confessional, or credal differences of the two Churches, must be entirely removed from the political sphere. (*b*) Each party must try to be perfectly just to the other. (*c*) All useless controversies must be avoided and a fair and honest method of controversy instituted. (*d*) Each Church must earnestly try to appreciate and properly understand the religious and spiritual life of the other. (*e*) A higher unity, and the attainment of a truth which now lies beyond the grasp of both Churches, must be held up as the final ideal. The faithful application of these principles in Christian brotherhood will eventually accomplish the Reunion of Christendom.

(3) The Coming Catholicism will be *Catholic*. The principles of Catholic Unity clearly manifest in the second Christian century are a normal and inevitable development of Apostolic Christianity. They have always been maintained by the Church, and will be even more dominant in the future than in the present. The great Catholic principles, as I have shown,[1] embrace these three things: (*a*) A consciousness of geographical unity in one Church spread throughout the world; (*b*) Historical unity by succession with the apostles—this involves that nothing shall be regarded as Catholic that cannot be derived as a normal development of the Apostolic Church; (*c*) Vital or mystic unity with Christ—this involves

[1] See pp. 49 *f.*

that Christian life and worship, as instituted by the historic Christ, and maintained by union with the reigning Christ, shall be conserved as making the Church truly holy; in other words, the Catholic Church must be holy and apostolic, and so, truly Catholic.

Now, all the great historic Churches of Protestantism, as well as the Roman, Greek and Oriental Churches, hold to these Catholic principles in theory; but in fact they all, without exception, sin against them in practices, which are not in accord with these Catholic principles. They err by excess and by defect. The Church of the future will recede from these excesses, and overcome these defects, and so become more truly Catholic. In British Christianity, the Anglicans exaggerate apostolicity; the Puritans, sanctity; the Roman Catholics, geographical unity in the Holy See. What is excess in the one is defect in the others.

The three features of Catholic Unity are involved in the saying of Vincent of Lerins: "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*"[1] This principle is universally recognised as valid; but in its application there is again excess on the one side and defect on the other. The Church all through its history has been impatient of results. It was determined to decide by Councils and Synods and Popes, rather than wait for the decision of the Holy Spirit. The fundamental Catholic principle is that the Holy Spirit will lead into all the truth; and that He will lead the universal Church into the possession of all the truth. The Church should always have waited until the divine Spirit had brought about the consensus, and not have forced the issue prematurely at the cost of discord, heresy and schism.

St. Augustine gave another phrase which has been of great significance here: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*"[2] It was this phrase, as quoted by Wiseman—"Therefore the entire world judges with security that they are not just who separate themselves from the entire world"—which made Newman a Roman Catholic. This principle is again correct, but the use

[1] See p. 69. [2] See p. 68.

made of it is often erroneous. It is quite true that the universal Church judges under the guidance of the divine Spirit, and in that judgment is at peace with itself, in unity with the divine Lord and the entire brotherhood; but it is not true that the individual Christian is bound to submit to the authority of the majority vote of a Christian Council, or of a Pope, unrecognised by the majority of Christians throughout the world.

The ecclesiastical authorities are always impatient for the decision, and are not content to wait until the divine Spirit has brought the world-wide Church to a knowledge of the truth and a conscientious acceptance of it. The ecclesiastics force the decision, and offend the consciences of a multitude of Christians as truly Christian as themselves. The Christian conscience rebels against a dogma that is forced upon it by external authority, without sufficient evidence to convince the intelligence. These ecclesiastics claim to themselves the possession of the divine Spirit, and deny it to brethren of equal rank, ability and piety with themselves. In such cases, the universal Church does not decide; and it certainly does not decide with security, in the possession of the Lord's peace and unity, but in strife and divisions entirely contrary to the principle of Catholic Unity. The time is coming when the true Catholic principle will reassert itself, when it will be truly and calmly applied. The concord, the consensus, of Christendom will be recognised universally as the judgment of the divine Spirit, and the dissensus as an evidence that the divine Spirit has not yet given His decision through the universal Church.

4. The Coming Catholicism will be *orthodox*. The divine Spirit, though grieved, never abandons the Christian Church. In the midst of all the strife and discord, the heresies and schisms, he still continues His gracious guidance. The decisions of the ancient Councils give the standard of Christian orthodoxy from which the Church will never depart. These decisions were premature and, as the history of the Church shows, in every case ineffective. The doctrines did not win

acceptance because of these decisions, but in spite of them, by the slow process of reflection and discussion in the Christian world.[1] The Nicene faith hung in the balance for several generations, and only gradually, in spite of conciliar action, won the consensus of the Christian world. This ought to have taught the Christian Church a wholesome lesson, but it did not. The way of ecclesiastical authority has ever been the way the Church has preferred, at the cost of numberless heresies and schisms. The venerable proverb, "More haste, less speed," has been illustrated nowhere else more truly than in the history of Christian Councils.

At the same time, the wrath of man was overruled by God to his praise, and the decisions of the Christian Councils did eventually gain the consensus of the Church and will never be overruled. It is true that modern men take exception to the formulas in which the doctrines are expressed, and it is characteristic of Modernists that they are striving to set these doctrines in modern forms and expressions which will make them no longer abstractions, but realities to the modern world. This is one of the phases of the battle that is now raging between Modernists and Mediævalists. The Mediævalists maintain that the form of the doctrine is as necessary as its substance; that we must accept the philosophical formula as well as the Christian material. But Modernists rightly claim that the modern age of the world has its rights, no less than the mediæval and the ancient, that it is impossible for moderns to think, feel and act in the traditional moulds of former ages which are unfamiliar to modern experience. The letter of these doctrines is dead, the living substance is wrapped in grave clothes. That these doctrines may live for us, these grave bands must be stripped off. Lazarus must come forth into the realities of the modern world. This is not to destroy the doctrines, it is rather to make them live again. It is not to bury them, but to raise them from the dead. It is not to substitute error and heresy for the doctrinal judgments of Christianity. It

[1] See p. 234.

is to banish all error and heresy, due chiefly to misconceptions and misstatements of the theologians, by letting the pure, unadulterated, undefiled truth shine forth from the new candelabra upon which the ancient lamps of orthodoxy are now being placed.

(5) We might go down through the long highway of Christian History, and show that whatever has won the consensus of the Christian Church will always remain in the Christian Church, as a final judgment of the divine Spirit wrought out in the Christian experience of the universal Church; but I must hasten to a conclusion. Which of the two great Christian bodies, Protestant or Roman Catholic, is to prevail in the future Catholicism? I do not hesitate to say: Neither. Both have their contributions to make to the Coming Catholicism. Whatever is genuine in Protestantism will pass over into the Coming Catholicism; whatever is not genuine will pass away. What is true and right in Roman Catholicism will abide; what is not altogether true and right will be thrown aside. Protestantism and Roman Catholicism will eventually rise above all the mists of prejudice, and the walls and citadels of ancient conflicts into the clear, bright heaven of eternal realities, and continue in a glorious brotherhood. Each, in its way, went through a crisis of reformation which has not yet reached its goal. Each, in its own way, is advancing toward a divinely appointed destination. Each has an important contribution to make to the Coming Catholicism, in which not only Protestant and Roman Catholic, but also Greek and Syrian, Armenian and Copt—yes, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and even India, China and Japan—will share; for in a world-wide religion, embracing all the races of mankind, every nation and every race will have something to say and something to do.

What, then, will be the great distinguishing principle of Coming Catholicism? It is the principle of *sanctification by love*. It must be evident to all, that we have come into an ethical age, a sociological age; an age which resents mere dogma, and insists upon the realities of life; which cannot be

satisfied with faith only, but demands good works; an age for holy men and women; an age whose impulse can be no other than holy, Christlike, self-sacrificing love.

This age is not worse than others. It is better. The Church has always from the beginning been growing better. Christ, the Head of the Church,

> also loved the Church and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing: but that it should be holy and without blemish. (Eph. v. 25–27.)

We cannot doubt that our Lord has been, and is now, fulfilling His ideal. All History attests it, Christian experience manifests it, the ambition of multitudes of Christians throughout the world shows that, though the ideal has not yet been entirely accomplished, the advance toward it is more vigorous, more wide-spread, more determined and more effectual than ever before. Men are more and more convinced that nothing else but holy, Christlike love will solve the problems of the present age, and make the future what all men of goodwill earnestly hope for. It alone will reconcile Christian to Christian, and bring about the peace and unity of the Church. It alone will give Christian thinkers and workers that liberty of conscience and opinion and practice which is indispensable to solve the hard problems inherited from the past, and those forced upon us by new conditions and circumstances in the present. It alone will reconcile Jew and Christian, for this is the ethical principle which binds Old Testament and New in indissoluble union: it is the everlasting *Shema* of Jew and Christian alike. It alone will reconcile labour and capital, and solve the economic and industrial difficulties, with which the success of Christianity in our day is so inextricably involved. It alone will persuade the heathen world that Christianity is something more than the imposition of Western manners and customs, and an alien civilization, upon an unwilling Orient. It alone will knit together all nations and

races in a Coming Catholicism which shall realise the highest ideals of Christianity.

When once the great fundamental Catholic principle of Holy Love has become the material principle of entire Christianity, it will fuse all differences, and, like a magnet, draw all into organic unity about that centre where Love itself most truly reigns. Nothing in this world can stand against such a Catholic Church. She will speedily draw all mankind into the kingdom of our God and Saviour.

INDEX

Abaddon, 342.
Abbot, Archbishop, 95, 130, 135.
Absolution, 251 *f.*
Accidents, eucharistic, 267 *f.*, 286 *f.*
Acts of uniformity, 141, 367 *f.*, 374 *f.*
Adiaphoristic controversy, 390.
Advent, second, 335, 340, 345, 363–4.
Aërius, 84.
Agnosticism, 397.
Alasco, 91.
Alexander of Hales, 130.
Altar-table, 276.
Ambrose, 134.
Anabaptists, 170, 340, 345, 428.
Andrews, Bishop, 132, 135.
Anencletus, 108.
Anglo Catholics, 80, 367 *f.*, 375 *f.*, 379 *f.*
Anicetus, 59.
Apology of Augsburg, 139.
Apostle, 47.
Apostolicity, 50 *f.*
Aquinas, 138, 248, 402, 403, 441.
Arianism, 301.
Aristotle, 402 *f.*
Arius, 301, 316.
Armachanus, 130.
Arminianism, 307, 320 *f.*, 335, 341 *f.*, 345, 349.
Articles, Chicago Lambeth, 6, 23, 73 *f.*, 182, 189 *f.*, 191, 246, 305, 388 *f.*, 391. See also Quadrilateral.
Articles of Religion, 66, 184, 238, 253, 269, 272, 308, 312, 384–5.
Assumption of Virgin, 394.
Attrition, 251.
Augustine, 68, 233, 237, 324, 329, 355, 358, 446.
Authority in Religion, 223 *f.*, 321, 337.
Autographs, 329.

Bancroft, Archbishop, 132, 134, 135, 150, 375.
Baptism, 247 *f.*, 413; of desire, 263, 341; of infants, 334.
Baptists, 345.
Barlow, Bishop, 150.
Baur, F. C., 290.
Baxter, 91, 92, 97, 98, 248, 328, 383.
Bellarmin, 400.
Beza, 131.
Bible, means of grace, 332 *f.* See also Scripture.
Billot, 138, 403.
Bishops, diocesan, 88, 94; monarchical, 105; parochial, 84, 87, 94.
Body of Christ, 44, 280 *f.*, 289.
Bossuet, 400.
Brown, Francis, 328, 361.
Browning, 14.
Bruce, A. B., 328.
Bucer, 12, 91, 128, 150, 269.
Bugenhagen, 95.
Bunyan, 92.
Bureaucracy, Roman, 219, 437.
Burnet 141.
Burton, Henry, 308.
Butler, Bishop, 320, 341–2.

Cærularius, 414.
Calamy, 97.
Calixtus, 12.
Calling, effectual, 349, 355.
Call to the Ministry, 172.
Calvin, 91, 131, 139, 265, 269, 271, 297, 328, 355, 358, 428.
Calvinism, 321.
Camarilla, 393, 407.
Camorra, 437.
Canon of the Mass, Anglican, 276–7; Greek, 276; Roman, 262.
Canon of Scripture, 54, 58.

Canons of Dort, 307.
Capernaitical, 283.
Cardinals, 215, 423.
Cartwright, 11, 91, 92, 129.
Cassander, 241, 280, 421.
Catechism, Roman, 282, 288; Westminster, 351.
Catholic, name, 46 *f.*; reaction, 69 *f.*
Catholicism, coming, 442 *f.*
Catholicity, 4 *f.*, 445 *f.*; and apostolicity, 50 *f.*; and Roman, 57 *f.*; ethical principle, 61 *f*; geographical, 66 *f.*; and orthodoxy, 55 *f.*; religious principle, 64 *f.*
Ceremonies of Worship, 366 *f.*
Character, episcopal, 149 *f.*, 158 *f*; ministerial, 153 *f.*
Cheyne, 328.
Chrism, 254.
Christ, 363 *f.*; king, 358; mediator, 293; preaching to spirits in prison, 344, 360; pre-existent, 292; priest, 275, 280, 358; prophet, 357 *f.*; sacrifice, 281; virgin birth, 364.
Christophanies, 126, 283, 295.
Church, Advance of, 316 *f.*; Biblical doctrine of, 23 *f.*; consistorial, 172; and creed, 299 *f.*; denominational, 172, 178 *f.*; of Denmark, 95; of England, 366 *f.*; episcopal, 172; national, 172, 177 *f.*, 207; œcumenical, 172; presbyterial, 172; and State, 74 *f.*, 217; of Sweden, 95; the term, 24 *f.*
City of God, 39.
Clement of Alexandria, 52.
Clement of Rome, 59, 62–3, 108.
College of presbyters, 84, 106, 108, 144.
Collier, 134.
Commission, Apostolic, 102 *f.*, 124 *f.*, 299; Biblical, 211, 393; Royal, 374 *f.*, 378, 385 *f.*
Communion meal, 276.
Communion with God, 428.
Comprehensiveness, 17 *f.*
Conception, immaculate, 231, 235, 403.
Concordat, 216 *f.*
Conference, Lambeth, 136, 165; at Poissy, 297.
Confession, act of, 251 *f.*; of Augsburg, 241, 260, 261, 308; Gallican, 270, 325; Westminster, 11, 66 *f.*, 184, 186, 191, 225, 226, 308, 310, 311, 317, 328, 335, 347, 350.
Confirmation, 247 *f.*, 254 *f.*
Congregations, Roman, 401, 422 *f.*
Congregationalists, 78.
Conscience, 223 *f.*, 430.
Consensus, 5 *f.*, 54, 243.
Consistory, 170.
Constitution of the Apostles, 300.
Consubstantiation, 268 *f.*
Contrition, 251.
Convention, diocesan, 98; general, 170.
Conversion, eucharistic, 268 *f.*
Council, of Basle, 415, 417; of Chalcedon, 302 *f.*; of Constance, 415, 417; of Constantinople, 302; of the Dedication, 302; of Florence, 415; of Jerusalem, 240; of the Lateran, 267; of Nice, 55–6, 234, 301 *f.*; œcumenical, 55 *f.*, 167, 415; of Pisa, 417; of Toledo, 303; of Trent, 184, 187, 191, 207, 213, 234, 247, 249–50, 273 *f.*, 278–9, 282, 286, 306–7, 415, 432; of Vatican, 214, 228 *f.*, 406, 416.
Counsels of perfection, 61, 429.
Counter reformation, 249.
Cranmer, 117, 150, 420.
Creed, Apostles', 58, 60, 187, 299 *f.*, 305, 312, 318–9; Athanasian, 303; Constantinopolitan, 302 *f.*; of Jerusalem, 302; Lucian, 302; Nicene, 56, 187, 241, 301 *f.*, 318–19; Roman, 60, 300, 303.
Creeds, 10, 299 *f.*; interpretation of, 188.
Crisis, American, 315 *f.*; Anglican, 366 *f.*
Criticism, Biblical, 242, 309; Higher, 326 *f*; Historical, 242, 330; Textual,, 325.
Crypto Catholicism, 368 *f.*, 376.
Cunningham, 141.
Curia, Roman, 393 *f.*, 398 *f.*, 406 *f.*, 416, 423 *f.*, 437 *f.*
Curio, 345.
Cyprian, 414.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 302.

Davidson, A. B., 328.
Deacons, 83.
Delitzsch, Fr., 39, 328.
De Wette, 28.
Didache, 61, 64.
Didascalia, 299.
Diocese, 171.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 414.
Dionysius of Corinth, 62.
Directory, Westminster, 90, 99.
Discipline, Church, 374 *f.*; 411.
Disestablishment, 386.
Dissensus, 6 *f.*
Divorce, 192, 211–12.
Donatists, 58, 68.
Dorner, I. A., 95, 328, 331, 332, 338, 353.
Driver, 328, 361.
Duchesne, 316, 445.
Dury, John, 131.

Eating, eucharistic, 295 *f.*
Ecclesia, 24 *f.*
Ecstasy, 295 *f.*
Education, public, 75, 211–12.
Edwards, Jonathan, 318.
Elders, ruling, 83.
Election of grace, 336.
Encyclical against Modernism, 39 *f.*
Ephraim Syrus, 350.
Episcopate, Historic, 73 *f.*; as a term of union, 79 *f.*; advantages of, 93 *f.*; grounds of opposition to, 82 *f.*; restoration of, 159.
Erasmus, 420.
Erastianism, 74 *f.*
Eschatology, 334, 357 *f.*
Essentials of Christianity, 4.
Estcourt, 123, 155.
Eternal, Biblical meaning, 361.
Ethics, Christian, 355, 361.
Eucharist, 247 *f.*; expiation in, 272; institution of, 279; religious principle of unity, 64 *f.*; a sacrifice, 64, 272; Calvinistic theory of, 271 *f.*, 370, 385; Lutheran theory, 271 *f.*, 385; Zwinglian theory, 264, 271, 370.
Eusebius, 62, 301.
Evangelicalism, 318, 320, 322, 325.
Evolution, 439.

Fairford, Bishop, 140, 142.
Faith of the Church, 184.
Faith cure, 250.
Family of God, 42.
Farel, 139.
Fatherhood of God, 337.
Feeling, religious, 223 *f.*
Field, Richard, 92, 129, 131, 133, 136–7.
Fisher, G. P., 328.
Flock of Christ, 38.
Fogazaro, 407–8.
Forbes, John, 280.
Forgiveness of Sins, 337.
Form of ordination, 111 *f.*
Formula of Concord, 184, 268, 271, 307, 390.
Friends, 270. See Quakers.
Fulke, 21.
Functions, of government, 169, 218, 244; priestly, 156; prophetic, 155; royal, 155.

Gehenna, 361.
Gnosticism, 46, 51, 58.
Goodwin, John, 308.
Gordon, case of, 111, 113.
Gore, Bishop, 80, 83, 85, 88 *f.*, 92, 248, 289, 328, 376.
Grace, efficient, 258; irresistible, 259; prevenient, 349; sacramental, 258 *f*, 340; sufficient, 258.
Gregory the Great, 424.
Grotius, 12, 280, 416.

Hades, 343 *f.*, 361 *f.*
Halifax, Lord, 381.
Hall, Bp., 91–2, 133, 139–40.
Hamilton, Bishop, 140, 142.
Harnack, 51, 57, 59, 83, 204, 444–5.
Hase, 353.
Hatch, 80, 83.
Heaven, 344.
Hermann, Archbishop, 128
Hermas, 47, 61, 344.
Heylyn, 133 *f.*
Hippolytus, 63.
Hitchcock, R. D., 293.
Hodge, A. A., 348.
Hodge, Chas., 269, 312.
Hook, 134.
Hooker, 91–2, 129, 131, 133, 140.
Hort, 24, 28–9.
Hosius, 301.

House of God, 40 *f.*
Household of God, 42.

Ignatius, 47, 59, 61 *f.*, 47.
Immanence, 397.
Immolation, 273, 279.
Impanation, 284.
Incarnation, 364.
Incense, 366 *f.*
Independents, 170.
Index, Papal, 211, 394, 401.
Inerrancy, 328 *f.*, 430, 438.
Infallibility, 221 *f.*; of the Bible, 236 *f.*; of Christian consensus, 233 *f.*; of the Church, 226 *f.*; executive, 244; judicial, 244; legislative, 244; of œcumenical councils, 226 *f.*; of the Pope, 228 *f.*; relative, 244 *f.*; threefold, 243 *f.*
Inquisition, new, 394, 405 *f.*
Inspiration, 239, 325.
Institution, words of, 267, 276.
Intention, in ordination, 111 *f.*
Interims, 390.
Intermediate State, 335 *f.*, 349, 350 *f.*, 357 *f.*
Intolerance, 20.
Ireland, Archbishop, 410 *f.*
Irenæus, 48 *f.*, 59, 61, 64, 205, 300, 414.
Irenics, defined, 1; its spirit, 9 *f.*, its tasks, 9 *f.*; relation to polemics, 2 *f.*; to symbolics, 1.

Janssen, 403.
Jerome, 324.
Jesuits, 407, 429.
Judgment, at death, 339; final, 345.
Jure divino theories, 81, 83, 86 *f.*, 92, 164.
Jure humano theories, 81, 83, 94, 96, 164.
Jurisdiction, appellate, 169, 171; concurrent, 181, 256; ecclesiastical, 169 *f.*; of doctrines, 181 *f.*; original, 169; of morals, 191 *f.*, 195; of persons, 193 *f.*, of the Pope, 206, 413 *f.*; territorial, 176 *f.*
Justification, 335, 338 *f.*, 341, 347 *f.*, 353, 363, 431.
Justin, 48, 61, 63, 64.

Kahnis, 331–2, 353.
Kant, 353.
Keble, 370.
Kenosis, 363.
Kingdom of Christ, 358; of God, 33 *f.*
Knox, John., 91, 129.

Langen, 108.
Laud, Archbishop, 91 *f.*, 95, 133 *f.*, 139 *f.*, 150, 378, 380.
Laying on of hands, 111, 154, 254.
Leibnitz, 12, 267, 272, 416.
Leighton, Bishop, 140 *f.*, 154.
Leo XIII., 12, 21, 67, 110, 112, 114, 121, 124, 144, 403, 432.
Liberty of worship, 367 *f.*, 388 *f.*
Lightfoot, Bishop, 80, 83, 85.
Lights in processions, 366 *f.*
Lindsay, John, 131.
Linus, 108.
Liturgies, 390.
Livingston, 91.
Logos, 293.
Loisy, 394 *f.*, 398 *f.*, 404, 428.
Lost, souls of, 360 *f.*
Love, 22, 431, 449; of God, 335 *f.*; principle of unity, 62.
Lucian, 302.
Luther, 91, 206, 268–9, 317, 328, 343, 358, 414, 417 *f.*, 420, 428.
Lutheranism, 80.

MacColl, 377.
Manichæism, 356.
Manning, Cardinal, 370.
Marcellus, 300.
Marcion, 51, 58, 204.
Marriage, 75, 192, 211–2, 255 *f.*
Marshall, Stephen, 91.
Martensen, 95, 331–2, 353.
Mason, Fr., 92, 130 *f.*, 133.
Mass, 272; Anglican, 261, 275; Roman, 276.
Matrimony, 247 *f.*
Matter of ordination, 111.
Maurice of Saxony, 128.
Mediævalism, 369, 402 *f.*, 438.
Medicine, pastoral, 252.
Melanchthon, 12, 91, 128, 269, 416.
Melville, 91, 92.
Methodists, 80, 312, 349, 381.
Middle State, 335, 357 *f.*
Millennium, 340.

Minchah, 274.
Moberly, 376.
Moderator, 100.
Modernists, 233, 396 *f.*, 400 *f.*, 435 *f.*
Möhler, 290, 352, 400.
Monsignori, 423.
Montanism, 58.
More, Sir Thomas, 420.
Morin, 84.
Mortification, 356.
Müller, Julius, 331, 353
Multipresence, 284 *f.*
Mystery, 248.

Neale, 135 *f.*
Neander, 328, 428.
Nectarius, 134.
Newman, Cardinal, 67 *f.*, 284, 370, 399 *f.*, 446
Nitzsch, 353.
Nonconformists, 386 *f.*

Omnipresence, 285.
Opus operatum, 259 *f.*, 262.
Order, 247 *f.*, 255; form of, 151; functions of, 152 *f.*; jurisdiction of, 152 *f.*; matter of, 151; sacrament of, 149 *f.*, 151.
Orders, Anglican, 110 *f.*, 432; Presbyterian, 127 *f.*; recognition of, 161 *f.*; sacramental, 123; validity of, 102 *f.*
Ordinal, 99; Anglican, 149; Edwardine, 113 *f.*, 124; Protestant Episcopal, 154 *f.*; Sarum, 122; Scottish, 142.
Ordinations, 88 *f.*; episcopal, 99 *f.*; per saltum, 135 *f.*; presbyterial, 99 *f.*, 162 *f.*; valid, 107.
Ordo salutis, 348 *f.*, 352, 359.
Origen, 316.
Orthodoxy, 5, 55 *f.*, 447.
Oxford movement, 366, 369 *f.*

Paget, Bishop, 248.
Papacy, 108; absolutism of, 219, 410 *f.*; Biblical basis of, 202 *f.*; constitutionalised, 212 *f.*, 421 *f.*; domain of, 210; historic right, 205 *f.*; primacy of, 205 *f.*, 207 *f.*; real and ideal, 201 *f.*; reformation of, 219–220.
Paradise, 344.
Parker, Archbishop, 127, 150.
Patience, 19 *f.*
Patriarchates, 171–2.
Peace of the Church, 443.
Penance, 247 *f.*, 251 *f.*
People of God, 37 *f.*
Peter Martyr, 91, 128.
Philo, 293.
Pietism, 318.
Pius I, 108.
Pius IX, 211, 393–4.
Pius X, 121, 211, 393 *f.*, 408, 420, 425, 437.
Plato, 403.
Pliny, 61.
Plymouth brethren, 355–6.
Polemics, 2 *f.*, 7.
Polycarp, 47, 59.
Pontifical, 124.
Poole, 326.
Precedent of 1610.
Predestination, 336.
Premillenarianism, 340.
Presbyter bishops, 83, 105 *f.*
Presbyterianism, 78.
Presbytery, 82, 169.
Presence, christophanic, 288 *f.*; sacramental, 263 *f.*, 370.
Preservation of body, 297 *f.*
Priest, functions of, 278.
Priesthood, 103 *f.*, 115 *f.*, 119 *f.*, 156; of Christ, 275; universal, 431 *f.*
Primacy, of Peter, 202 *f.*; of the Pope, 58; of Rome, 58. Also see Papacy.
Probation, 339, 341 *f.*, 349, 362.
Prophecy, 103 *f.*, 118 *f.*, 155.
Proposals of 1661, 98.
Protestantism, 206 *f.*, 213, 336, 355, 428 *f.*, 433 *f.*; principles of, 429 *f.*
Punishment, eternal, 361 *f.*
Purgatory, 334, 338, 354, 363.
Puritanism, 318, 345, 368 *f.*, 379 *f.*, 433.
Pusey, 370.

Quadrilateral of Unity, 6, 23, 70, 73 *f.*, 246. See also Articles, Chicago Lambeth.
Quakers, 263, 345, 428.

Rationalism, 320, 322, 325.

Reaction, Catholic, 69 *f.*
Reason, 430.
Redemption, after death, 341 *f.*; narrow views of, 338.
Reform of Catholic Church, 233.
Reformation, principles of, 317 *f.*; right of, 416.
Regeneration, 349, 355, 362; baptismal, 262.
Repentance, 251 *f.*
Representation, eucharistic, 278 *f.*
Reservation of sacrament, 366 *f.*, 370 *f.*
Resurrection of Christ, 281.
Reunion, 410 *f.*, 444. See also Unity.
Revision of Symbols, 308 *f.*, 416.
Reynolds, Bishop, 11, 97
Ritschl, 331.
Robinson, Ed., 91.
Royalty, 103 *f.*, 155
Rubrics, 367 *f.*, 371.
Rufinus, 300.
Rutherford, 91, 328.
Ryle, 328.

Sabatier, 437.
Sabbath, 192 *f.*
Sacrament, 370 *f.*
Sacramentalia, 257.
Sacraments, Calvinistic theory of, 264 *f.*; effects of, 294 *f.*; form and matter, 248 *f.*; grace of, 258 *f.*; institution of, 247; Lutheran theory of, 271 *f.*, 385; means of grace, 249 *f.*; minor ones, 250 *f.*; number of, 246 *f.*; presence of Christ, 263 *f.*; the term, 248; Zwinglian theory, 264, 271, 370.
Sacrifice, of Christ, 277; of covenant, 274; eucharistic, 115 *f.*, 272 *f.*; kinds of, 273; parts of, 278 *f.*; Passover, 274; peace offering, 273 *f.*; sin offering, 273, 277 *f.*; trespass offering, 273, 278; unbloody offering, 273; whole burnt offering, 273, 277.
Salvation, 333; of heathen, 345 *f.*; of infants, 335, 345 *f.*
Salvationists, 170, 263, 270.
Sanctification, 335, 338 *f.*, 341, 348, 356, 431, 449; after death, 350 *f.*; immediate, 355.
Sanday, 83, 328, 377.
Satisfaction, 252 *f.*
Savoy Conference, 376.
Schaff, P., 12, 83, 307, 328, 353, 357, 417.
Schleiermacher, 428.
Scholasticism, 320, 402, 439.
Science, Christian, 250.
Scripture, Holy, 323 *f.*; canon of, 324. See also Bible, Canon, and Criticism.
Scrivener, 28.
Semi-Arminianism, 341 *f.*
Separatists, 68.
Sharp, Archbishop, 140 *f.*
Shedd, W. T., 312.
Sheol, 344.
Sin, against Holy Spirit, 353; mortal, 251 *f.*
Smith, H. B., 332, 357, 363.
Smith, H. P., 186, 328.
Smythe, Newman, 328, 426.
Socrates, 322.
Soter, 62.
Spinola, 12, 267, 272.
Spirit of God, in the Bible, 239, 333; in Canon of Mass, 261 *f.*; guidance of, 235 *f.*, 240 *f.*, 316; invocation of, 261 *f.*; regeneration by, 349; reviving influence, 318; sacramental work of, 261 *f.*; in theophany, 315.
Spottiswoode, 132, 134 *f.*, 140.
Staupitz, 338, 420.
Subscription, 164 *f.*, 185 *f.*, 238, 307.
Substance, christophanic, 292 *f.*; eucharistic, 286, 288.
Succession, apostolic, 58, 87 *f.*, 102 *f.*, 432; episcopal, 143, 149, 164; presbyterial, 143, 164.
Suggestion, 295 *f.*
Superintendent, 170.
Supralapsarianism, 337.
Sydserf, 140 *f.*
Syllabus of Pius IX, 211; of Pius X, 211, 393 *f.*
Symbolics, 1.
Symbols of Faith, 306 *f.*
Sympathy, 14 *f.*
Synagogue, 25 *f.*
Synod, 170; of Dort; 139, of Jamnia, 324; of Orange, 306, 321.

Taylor, Isaac, 319.
Taylor, Jeremy, 91.
Temperaments, 17.
Temperance, 193.
Temple of God, 40 *f.*
Tertullian, 300.
Tetzel, 414, 417, 419.
Thayer, 25, 328, 361.
Theology, Biblical, 17, 273, 309 *f.*, 330.
Theophanies, 283, 291, 293, 295.
Tholuck, 328, 353.
Tischendorf, 28.
Toleration, 388.
Tradition, apostolic, 241 *f.*
Traditionalists, 320, 439.
Transubstantiation, 267 *f.*
Travers, 91, 93.
Truth, 7 *f.*
Tuckney, 186.
Turmel, 108.
Tyrrell, 394, 398 *f.*, 403 *f.*

Ubiquity, 284.
Unction, 247 *f.*, 250.
Uniformity, 20, 182, 367 *f.*, 374 *f.*
Unitarians, 345.
Unity, Catholic, 70 *f.*; geographical, 66; threefold cord of, 412 *f.* See also Reunion.
Universalists, 345, 362.
Usher, 95, 383.

Validity, of orders, 102 *f.*; of Anglican orders, 110 *f.*; of Presbyterian orders, 127 *f.*
Van Dyke, H. J., 269.
Van Oosterzee, 328, 331 *f.*
Vasquez, 280.
Victor, Pope, 414
Vincent, Boyd, 81, 164.
Vincent of Lerins, 69, 232, 234.
Vincent, M. R., 328.
Vine of the Church, 38.
Vines, 326.
Viret, 139.
Virgin birth, 364.
Virtues, 429.
Vows, 194 *f.*

Wallis, 11, 326.
Welch, 91.
Wesley, 318.
Westcott, 28.
Whichcote, 186.
Whitby, 341, 342.
White, 91.
Whitefield, 318.
Whitgift, 91, 92, 95.
Wife of God, 43.
Wiseman, Cardinal, 68, 446.
Wordsworth, Bishop, 101, 108, 136, 144, 165.
Worship, 391 *f.*

Zwingli, 91, 268–9, 271, 317, 345 420.